

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1) 733/04-05
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

**Minutes of meeting held on
Tuesday, 21 December 2004, at 4:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Hon CHOY So-yuk (Chairman)
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP

Member attending : Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP

Members absent : Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yeet, GBS, JP

Public officers attending : **For item IV**
Environment, Transport and Works Bureau

Dr Sarah LIAO
Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works

Mr K K KWOK
Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and
Works (Environment)

Mr Roy TANG
Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works
(Environment) 2

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Rob LAW
Director of Environmental Protection

For item V

Environment, Transport and Works Bureau

Mr Roy TANG
Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works
(Environment) 2

Mr TSE Chin-wan
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment, Transport
and Works (Environment) 3

Civil Engineering Development Department

Mr David CHEUNG Hing-wan
Project Manager (NTW&N)

Mr Duncan SIU Sau-ching
Chief Engineer (NTW)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Maurice YEUNG Kwok-leung
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Noise Management & Planning)(Atg)

For item VI

Environment, Transport and Works Bureau

Mr Roy TANG
Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works
(Environment) 2

Mrs Teresa WONG
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment, Transport
and Works (Environment) 2

Mr TSE Chin-wan
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment, Transport
and Works (Environment) 3

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Dr F Y WONG
Assistant Director (Country and Marine Parks)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr P H LUI
Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Special Waste)

Mr C K CHEN
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Corporate Services)(Atg)

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

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

Miss Mandy POON
Legislative Assistant (1)4

Action

- I. Confirmation of minutes**
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 484/04-05 — Minutes of the meeting held on
18 November 2004)

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2004 were confirmed.

II. Information paper issued since last meeting

2. Members noted that the following information papers were issued since the last meeting -

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1) 319/04-05 — Decommissioning of the former Cheoy Lee Shipyard;
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 427/04-05 — Administration's response to the referral from Ms Emily LAU regarding traffic noise impact of the Tung Chau Street section of the West Kowloon Corridor; and
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 486/04-05 — Information paper on the "Progress of measures to address noise impact of existing roads" provided by the Administration.

III. Items for discussion at the next meeting

- (LC Paper No. CB(1) 485/04-05(01) — List of follow-up actions
LC Paper No. CB(1) 485/04-05(02) — List of outstanding items for discussion)

3. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 24 January 2005, at 2:30 pm -

- (a) Progress report on the management of construction and demolition materials;
- (b) West New Territories Landfill Extensions; and
- (c) Progress of measures to address noise impact of existing roads

4. The Chairman informed members that a special meeting had been scheduled for Friday, 21 January 2005, from 9:35 am to 10:35 am to receive a briefing from the Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works on the relevant policy initiatives in the Chief Executive's Policy Address 2005.

IV. Staffing proposal on handling cross-boundary environmental issues

- (LC Paper No. CB(1) 485/04-05(03) — Paper provided by the Administration)

5. The Chairman advised that when the proposal on the merging of the Environment Branch of the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau with the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) was discussed at the Panel meeting on 25 October 2004, the Administration was requested to review the redeployment of resources saved from the merger. At the meeting of the Establishment Subcommittee on 17 November 2004, the Administration was also urged to strengthen the directorate level input in dealing with cross-boundary issues, in particular regional air pollution.

Action

Having considered the level of responsibility and the expertise required, the Administration proposed to create one Administrative Officer Staff Grade B (AOSGB)(D3) post and one Principal Environmental Protection Officer (PEPO) (D1) post in the new EPD with effect from 1 April 2005.

6. The Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (SETW) then briefed members on the proposal to strengthen staffing support for EPD at the directorate level to deal with new and urgent cross-boundary issues by highlighting the salient points in the Administration's information paper.

7. Ms Emily LAU enquired about the existing practice in dealing with cross-boundary environmental issues. SETW said that liaison with the Mainland authorities was not an easy task. At present, endorsement from the Central People's Government and the State Environmental Protection Administration had to be obtained for the implementation of cross-boundary environmental policies. By way of illustration, prior approval from the Guangdong Environmental Protection Bureau (GDEPB) had to be sought for implementing the pilot projects on emissions trading and the Co-operation Agreement on Cross-Boundary Disposal of Dredged Mud and Public Fill. The Administration had to report annually to the Hong Kong/Guangdong Joint Committee, which was co-chaired by the Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Governor of the Guangdong Provincial Government, on the latest development on cross-boundary issues. The Hong Kong/Guangdong Joint Working Group on Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection, which was co-chaired by SETW and the Director-General of GDEPB, was responsible for setting out the work plan to deal with cross-boundary issues. As these issues covered a wide spectrum, a number of working groups had been set up to share out the work. After obtaining the necessary endorsement, the liaison work as well as details of implementation would be followed up by the Deputy Secretary of Environment, Transport and Works (Environment)² (DSETW(E)²) in addition to his normal duties.

8. Ms Emily LAU questioned the need and efficacy of the proposed AOSGB(D3) post in strengthening liaison with the Mainland authorities. Ms Audrey EU also enquired whether the proposed AOSGB(D3) post was required because the ranking of the liaison staff had affected the progress of cross-boundary issues in the past. SETW explained that the liaison work was currently undertaken by DSETW whose ranking at D3 level was on a par with the ranking of the proposed AOSGB(D3) post. She stressed that it was not the ranking, but rather, the availability of dedicated resources which was essential to make the liaison work more effective. The existing practice was far from satisfactory as a lot of new and urgent issues such as acid rain could not be dealt with in an expeditious manner due to the lack of dedicated staff resources. The creation of an AOSGB (D3) post to head a dedicated cross-boundary team was thus necessary to take up the liaison work. The team would be able to follow up more closely the implementation of the Pan-Pearl River Delta (PRD) Region Environmental Protection Cooperation Agreement as well as the PRD Regional Air Quality Management Plan. It would maintain a constant dialogue with the Mainland counterparts, monitor the progress of measures agreed between the two

Action

governments and supervise the implementation of individual pollution programmes. It would also evaluate the effectiveness, determine priorities as well as take up with the senior level of the Guangdong Provincial Government, wherever necessary, to help smooth out implementation issues and introduce new measures and policies to improve the regional air quality. The increased efforts should be able to accelerate the implementation schedule so that improvements to the air quality could be achieved sooner. Hong Kong had been regarded by the Guangdong authorities as a catalyst to push forward environmental reforms and cooperation had already been sought from GDEPB in the provision of clean energy production and supply systems such as gas-fired systems to replace coal-fired power plants, the transmission of electricity from the western provinces and the stricter enforcement of environmental legislation.

9. SETW added that apart from liaison work, the dedicated cross-boundary team was also expected to be proactively involved in the 16 international conventions to which Hong Kong was a member. In the past, Hong Kong was seen to be lagging behind counterparts like Singapore in participating as well as implementing these international conventions due to the lack of staff resources. It was high time Hong Kong should catch up and gain experience from overseas experience, in particular from conventions such as the Earth Summit held in Johannesburg. The Chairman agreed to the need for the Administration to actively participate in international conferences so that the overseas experience gained could be suitably adapted to Hong Kong.

10. Mr LAU Kong-wah enquired if the proposed posts were created on a permanent basis and how assessment could be made on their effectiveness, given that the success of environmental improvement measures rested with the commitment and determination of the authorities. He also stressed that information on the sources of pollution, such as the number of polluting facilities etc, should be made available to facilitate assessment on the effectiveness of cross-boundary environmental improvement measures. In reply, SETW confirmed that the proposed posts would be on a permanent basis. As regards dissemination of information, SETW said that an emission inventory of polluting units in the PRD Region compiled by EPD over a period of three years could be found in the website of EPD. She added that policy formulation and implementation would be more effective if proper surveillance and monitoring were performed with the additional resources. As such, the dedicated cross-boundary team was expected to provide a catalytic effect in the exchange of information as well as the successful implementation of cross-boundary policies.

11. Mr Albert CHAN said that it might not be proper under the “one country two systems” principle for the dedicated cross-boundary team to investigate or conduct surveillance operations on the sources of pollution. A more effective means of investigation would be for green groups or the media to conduct undercover studies on polluting activities. Consideration could also be given to deploying the spare human resource capacity of the Office of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in Beijing (Beijing Office) to undertake the investigation work to obviate the need to create a dedicated team for the purpose. SETW advised that approval would need to be sought from GDEPB and the relevant authorities before

Action

proceeding with the investigation work. There would be information exchanges to ensure that the investigation work would benefit both sides. While enforcement was taken against a number of polluting activities after these were revealed by the media, this type of investigation could not be relied upon in the long run. A proper mechanism would have to be put in place to control polluting activities. The Beijing Office would not be able to undertake the investigation work given the speciality required in environmental control. Mr CHAN remained concerned about the effectiveness of the dedicated cross-boundary team and requested that a regular report on the progress of work should be provided to members. SETW said that annual reports would be provided by the Hong Kong/Guangdong Joint Working Group on Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection and members would be able to see for themselves the progress of achievements made by the new cross-boundary team.

12. While supporting in principle the setting up of the dedicated cross-boundary team, the Chairman enquired about the modus operandi of the team, and whether consideration would be given to setting up subcommittees or conducting regular inspection to different provinces. She also considered that, in addition to the efforts being made by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department, the team should also be tasked to combat illegal trading of endangered species. Mr WONG Yung-kan added that the team should look into measures to improve the water quality of Mirs Bay which was heavily polluted at the seabed. Concerted effort with the Mainland authorities should be made to reduce the pollution in the area which was in close proximity to Hong Kong.

13. In response, SETW confirmed that cross-boundary liaison was not confined to the Guangdong Province and Hong Kong was keen to share its experience in environmental protection with other provinces. As regards control against illegal trading of endangered species, DSETW(E)2 advised that this was one of the subjects being followed up by one of the special working groups set up under the Hong Kong/Guangdong Joint Working Group on Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection. SETW added that in order to protect the water environment as well as the marine and tourism resources, both sides had jointly conducted the Mirs Bay Water Quality Regional Control Strategy Study with a view to developing a regional water pollution control strategy. The Study, which was completed in March 2003, made projections on water quality changes and concluded that, in order to protect the Bay, development in the catchment should be capped below the carrying capacity of the Bay's water environment. Both sides had since maintained close liaison to exchange information on implementation of the strategy and major development and infrastructure projects that could have significant implications on the sustainability of the Bay's water environment.

14. Ms Audrey EU enquired whether, apart from official channels, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were able to participate in unofficial exchanges with the Mainland on environmental issues, thereby acting as an additional catalyst in the process. She also held the view that the setting up of a communication network and the building up of relations with the Mainland authorities were crucial to

Action

effective liaison. SETW agreed that the implementation of environmental policy could not be effective without the necessary public support. As such, participation of NGOs, such as green groups, in policy formulation was essential. By way of illustration, the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE), which consisted of a number of green groups, was involved in the policy-making process. However, it would take time for the Mainland authorities to adopt a similar approach in engaging public participation in policy formulation. As a first step, the emission data from the PRD Region would be uploaded onto the internet for public reference by the third quarter of 2005. The Environment Impact Assessment Consultative Committee, a newly established organization in Guangdong which was modelled after ACE, had invited membership from NGOs in Hong Kong. It was hoped that with more public participation, the process of policy formulation in the Mainland could be made more transparent.

15. Before concluding, the Chairman asked and members agreed that they supported the proposal in principle, and that the Administration was allowed to submit the proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee.

V. 7780TH - Retrofitting of noise barriers on Cheung Pei Shan Road, Tsuen Wan

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 485/04-05(04) — Paper provided by the Administration)

16. The Chairman informed members that the Administration planned to submit the proposal to retrofit noise barriers on the section of Cheung Pei Shan (CPS) Road between Shek Wai Kok Estate and Cheung Shan Estate in Tsuen Wan (the Project) to the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) on 26 January 2005. She also drew members' attention to the concern raised by Mr LEE Wing-tat at the PWSC meeting held on 24 November 2004 on the non-provision of noise barriers at the section of CPS Road in front of Lui Ming Choi Lutheran College (LMCLC).

17. At the Chairman's invitation, DSETW(E)2 gave an introduction on the Project which was meant to address the traffic noise impact of CPS Road on neighbouring residents. He noted that LMCLC had requested for the erection of additional noise barriers along the roadside of CPS Road westbound carriageway outside the College to protect it from the traffic noise. Such a request was not acceded to because all teaching activity-related rooms of LMCLC had already been provided with the necessary noise protection measures in the form of acoustic window insulation and air conditioning under the "Noise Abatement Programme" for schools. Besides, the said erection would add on to the already high cost of the Project which amounted to \$217 million, representing 26% of the total cost of \$816 million for the entire five-year installation programme for 12 road projects. In order to provide effective noise insulation for LMCLC by providing a full enclosure for the adjacent road section would cost about \$317 million, representing 38% of the cost for first stage works of the installation programme. This would not only add on to the time and cost of the Project, but also affect the delivery of other projects.

Action

18. While acknowledging the high cost to be incurred if a full enclosure of the section of the road in front of LMCLC was required, Mr LEE Wing-tat enquired about the feasibility and cost of extending the semi-enclosures to the road section concerned. The Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment)3 (PASETW(E)3) explained that the additional cost would be around \$20 million. However, the proposed extension would not be able to reduce the noise level to the acceptable level of below 65 decibels. The College would still have to close the windows of all classrooms and rely on air conditioning during classes. Mr LEE held the view that the additional provision of \$20 million was worth spending to provide protection to the affected students. PASETW(E)3 advised that the existing use of acoustic window insulation and air conditioning provided under the “Noise Abatement Programme” was able to reduce the noise level below the acceptable noise level of 65 decibels. He pointed out that the College would still have to close the windows and rely on air conditioning during classes with the extension of semi-enclosures as these could only reduce the noise levels to about 67 to 69 decibels. To enable the College to be fully protected from traffic noise by providing a full enclosure for the adjacent road section would cost over \$300 million.

19. Mr Albert CHAN said that the provision of noise barriers on the section of CPS Road had been awaited for over ten years. When the CPS Road was first built, the Administration insisted that the traffic noise could be abated through the planting of trees but this had proven to be ineffective. He therefore welcomed the Administration’s decision to install semi-enclosures to the road section at Tsui Shan Estate which had previously been turned down on technical grounds. He however considered it unfair for the Administration to decline the erection of semi-enclosures at the road section in front of LMCLC while providing the same for the Shun Yi Primary School which was situated along the same road as LMCLC. Given that there were not too many residential developments along the road section at Yi Pei Chun, he suggested transferring some of the noise barriers from this section of the road to the section in front of LMCLC to reduce the noise impact on the students at no extra cost.

20. In response, PASETW(E)3 explained that the provision of noise barriers at the road section in front of Shun Yi Primary School was not meant to protect the school from traffic noise but to protect the residential developments adjacent and/or behind the school. Even with the said provision, the school would still be exposed to noise levels of 67 decibels which was above the acceptable limit. It was not desirable to remove part of the cantilevered noise barrier along the road section at Yi Pei Chun as suggested since this would reduce the noise abating effect of the semi-enclosure if it was partially removed. Mr Albert CHAN however pointed out that the non-provision of noise barrier at the road section in front of LMCLC would expose the adjacent Lok Shan House to traffic noise.

21. Ms Emily LAU said that residents had long been waiting for the provision of noise barriers as they had been seriously affected by the traffic noise over the past years. She however stressed the need to use noise barriers of better aesthetic designs to avoid public criticism as in the case of the Castle Peak Road. She also queried if

Action

the acoustic windows had provided adequate protection for LMCLC from traffic noise. If so, the Tsuen Wan East Area Committee and the Traffic and Transport Committee of Tsuen Wan District Council (TWDC) would not have requested for the extension of semi-enclosures. Having regard to the need for a quiet environment for studies, she considered it necessary that further thoughts be given to the provision of noise barriers at the road section near LMCLC, which had been purposely excluded from the installation programme. PASETW(E)3 advised that the acoustic windows were able to reduce the level of noise by 10 to 20 decibels and as such, the noise level would be well below the acceptable level of 65 decibels if the windows were closed. The Chairman advised that the provision of noise barriers at the road section of CPS Road in front of LMCLC would be raised at the meeting-cum-luncheon between Legislative Council Members and TWDC members on 6 January 2005. It was to her understanding that TWDC members had expressed concern that the closing of windows and reliance on air conditioning was not only a waste of energy but also had affected the health of students due to poor circulation of air. They therefore requested that additional noise barriers be installed to reduce the noise level so that the windows could be opened during classes.

22. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that he was opposed to the provision of noise barriers as these were not only ineffective, but also expensive and unsightly, and would give rise to poor ventilation. However, noise barriers were installed in order to meet the requirements under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499). As a result, about \$1,085 million had been earmarked for the installation of noise barriers under three projects in the past two years. Given that some of the requirements on noise mitigation under the Ordinance were quite unreasonable, he had requested the Administration to review the Ordinance but to no avail. He held the view that even if noise barriers were deemed necessary, consideration should be given to avoiding using those of cantilever design measuring up to 11 metres high which required piling works. Noise barriers with transparent panels were more acceptable from an aesthetic point of view.

23. Referring to Enclosure 2 to the paper, Ms Emily LAU noted that semi-enclosures were only provided at the descending road section, but the same was not provided at the ascending section which was noisier while vehicles were going uphill. The Project Manager (NTW&N), Civil Engineering and Development Department (PM(NTW&N)) explained that semi-enclosures were provided at the descending section of the road to protect the up to 27 storey estate blocks situated next to the road. Meanwhile, as the heights of buildings adjacent to the ascending road section were only two to three storeys, cantilever designs instead of semi-enclosures would be provided. Ms LAU questioned whether the cantilevered barriers at the ascending road section could adequately protect the tall estate blocks from traffic noise. Sharing similar concern, Mr Albert CHAN considered that semi-enclosures should be provided at the ascending rather than descending section since vehicles tended to generate more noise when going uphill. He requested the Administration to provide a comparison table on the levels of noise before and after the installation of noise barriers.

Action

24. PASETW(E)3 said that according to the noise assessments, the proposed provision of semi-enclosures on the descending section and cantilevered barriers on the ascending section was found to be most effective in abating traffic noise. The result would not be as effective if the two types of noise barriers were interchanged. The proposed design of the noise barriers would benefit the 1 663 dwellings adjacent to the road section. Meanwhile, the Administration had explored the possibility of providing full enclosure to the road section but concluded that this was not desirable due to safety concerns and ventilation problems, particularly when gas pipes were installed beneath the roads. In case of fire and other accidents, a full enclosure would make rescue operations more difficult.

25. Regarding the choice of materials for the noise barriers, Mr Albert CHAN expressed concern that the use of glass panels would not only reflect noise but also give rise to an echoing effect, particularly at the road section near Shek Kuk House. PASETW(E)3 said that the echoing effect had been fully taken into consideration in the noise impact assessment. When designing the layout of the noise barriers, care was taken to ensure that much of the noise generated would be reflected within the semi-enclosure. The noise exposure of the 1 663 dwellings was expected to be reduced by as much as 18 decibels in some cases as a result of the installation of noise barriers. PM(NTW&N) added that noise absorbent materials would be used at the lower parts of the noise barriers to reduce the echoing effect.

26. Mr Albert CHAN was not convinced that the echoing effect associated with the use of glass panels could be contained within the semi-enclosure. He considered it necessary for the Administration to provide the noise impact studies on the Project for members' reference. Mr Jeffrey LAM shared members' concerns on the need for semi-enclosures at the ascending road section to mitigate the serious noise impact arising from vehicles going uphill and the echoing effect of cantilevered barriers. He did not agree with the Administration that full enclosures would give rise to safety concerns and pose difficulties for rescue operations as these problems could be overcome through the provision of emergency exits and hence should not be used as an excuse for non-provision.

27. PASETW(E)3 said that the design of noise barriers was proposed having regard to the outcome of a detailed noise assessment study and he would be pleased to provide members with a copy of the relevant assessment results. Mr Albert CHAN said that while he had no doubt that the provision of noise barriers could reduce the traffic noise, he considered it necessary that a comparison be made to ascertain the effectiveness of having semi-enclosure installed at the ascending road section rather than the descending road section as proposed by the Administration. Sharing similar views, the Chairman also requested the Administration to provide assessments on the echoing effect using transparent panels. These assessments should be made prior to the submission of the proposal to PWSC.

Admin

Admin

28. PM(NTW&N) responded that the echoing effect could be reduced if absorbent materials rather than transparent materials were used for the noise barrier panels. However, as a more aesthetic design was preferred, it was decided that transparent

Action

materials would be used for the upper panels and noise absorbent materials for the lower panels. Ms Emily LAU enquired about the type of materials used for the upper panels of noise barriers along the Tolo Harbour and how these compared with the materials used for the noise barriers at CPS Road. PASETW(E)3 advised that the former was made from absorbent materials while the latter was made from non-absorbent materials. Ms LAU queried why the non-absorbent type of barriers should be used along CPS Road when there was a pressing need to reduce the noise impact on the densely populated area. Mr Jeffrey LAM echoed that the transparent materials used would likely be made from plastic materials which had a stronger noise absorbent capacity than glass. However these plastic materials would have to be cleaned regularly to maintain their aesthetic effect. While a more aesthetic design was preferred for noise barriers along the Tolo Harbour, more effective noise barriers were required to reduce the traffic impact on the densely populated area along CPS Road. PM(NTW&N) confirmed that the transparent materials being used for the noise barriers were non-absorbent acrylic sheets.

29. In reply, PASETW(E)3 confirmed that more noise absorbent materials could be used for the barriers if members so wished. However, it was worth to note that the present design of the noise barriers was agreed by TWDC members after a balanced consideration of the aesthetic and noise abating needs of the community. DSETW(E)2 added that the Administration had to be prudent about the implementation of noise abatement measures having regard to experience gained from the installation of noise barriers along the Tolo Harbour. It would have to make further noise assessment based on computer modelling and to revert back to TWDC on any changes to the design as originally proposed.

30. Mr Albert CHAN also pointed to the need to use less reflective materials for the semi-enclosures to reduce the possible glaring effect which might affect the neighbouring community as well as the safety of drivers. PASETW(E)3 agreed to reconsider the choice of materials to be used taking into account members' concerns. The Chairman supported that more suitable materials should be used to help reduce both the glaring and echoing effects.

31. Before concluding, the Chairman asked and members agreed that they supported the proposal in principle, and that the Administration was allowed to submit the proposal to PWSC.

VI. Revision of fees and charges for environment and conservation related services

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 485/04-05(05) — Paper provided by the Administration)

32. DSETW(E)2 briefed members on the background to and the details of the proposed revision of Government fees and charges for certain environment and conservation related services which did not directly affect people's livelihood or general business activities.

Action

33. Noting that most of the fee revisions were business-related, Mr LEE Wing-tat enquired if there were any revisions which were non-business related. DSETW(E)2 advised that the proposed revision of fees and charges was targeted at environment and conservation related services which would not directly affect people's livelihood or general business activities.

34. On fee items related to waste disposal, the Chairman supported the principle of cost recovery in waste management and enquired about the types of fees that had been excluded from the fee revision exercise. DSETW(E)2 advised that the proposed revision would include all fees related to environment and conservation services but exclude those which would directly affect people's livelihood. Ms Emily LAU enquired if the affected trades had been consulted on the proposed revision. The Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment)2 said that the Administration was consulting users on the revised charges for disposal of chemical waste by circulation and the consultation was still underway.

35. On fee items related to dumping at sea, Mr Albert CHAN said that consideration should be given to introducing a punitive charge to curb illegal dumping at sea. DSETW(E)2 said that as Mr CHAN's proposal would involve legislative amendments, it fell outside the scope of the current fee revision exercise which was meant to recover cost.

36. On fee items related to sale of maps, Mr Albert CHAN held the view that it might not be worthwhile to revise the fees given the small increase from \$30 to \$34. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that as a hiker, he hoped that the fees for the sale of maps would not be increased. DSETW(E)2 emphasized the need to adhere to financial discipline and cost recovery principle as otherwise Government would be seen to be subsidizing the users. In view of members' concern, consideration might be given to seeking approval from the Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury as a special arrangement not to increase the fees on sale of maps. Ms Audrey EU however took a different view. She pointed out that as the fee increase for the sale of maps did not directly affect people's livelihood or general business activities, the principle of cost recovery should be strictly adhered to.

37. The Chairman asked members if they would support the proposal in principle. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that he would not agree to the proposed revision if the Administration refused to revise downwards the fees for the sale of maps.

VII. Any other business

38. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:15 pm.