

Panel on Environmental Affairs  
Legco  
HKSAR

“Environmental Impacts arising from the proposed construction of a LNG Receiving Terminal by the CLP Holdings at Sokos Island”

Submitted by:

Chu, T C (Mr)  
Save Our Shorelines

Dear Honourable Members,

Together with other NGO organizations, it has been about two years since we were invited by CLP Holdings to be part of the of the review process on the proposed construction of the LNG Review Terminal at Sokos Island. During this process, we have had ample opportunities to exchange views and engage in meaningful discussions with CLP. In the meantime, we have also been exposed to other NGOs views of this proposal and it is time that we would also seek the opportunity to express our thoughts to the public and the Legislative body.

It would have been a rather easy task, being a NGO in environmental protection and awareness to shorelines, to just say that we categorically opposed to this proposed construction. As in all construction, something would just have to be altered, disturbed and /or become a source of inconvenience to others. However, after spending some time and effort in thinking over the pros and cons, it is also not that farfetched to see that there are certain positive attributes to this proposal.

We cannot deny the fact that the major contribution to air pollution in the SAR is from power generation plants within our physical boundaries and those from the neighbouring newly economic developed and industrialised regions. While there is not very much we can do to influence our neighbours but appeal for their goodwill and sensibilities, we should, however, not bury our heads in the sand and believe that we can just “migrate” our responsibilities in improving our environment to them.

Much have been said that since there are also various proposals for similar facilities to be constructed in our vicinity, it would be more feasible to just “buy-in” or “tap-in” such proposals. Unless there is clear evidences which shows such facilities can indeed meet the same timeline, have the capacities to cater to our present and future needs and actually be more economical for the end users, I would rather think that “a bird in hand is more preferable than a few in the sky”!! May I also like to remind the proponents of such

to also take an in-depth look at the reliability and environmental issues of power supply of our neighbours versus the ones we have.

Issues are also raised on the potential safety and disturbances of humans and non-humans during and after the construction phase in choosing Sokos over other probabilities -- namely the existing gas generation plant at Black Point. I must admit that I also questioned the wisdom of not building the facility right next to the end-user but after witnessing the heavy marine traffic and the number of human inhabitants along the route which the carriers have to sail through to reach Black Point, I would rather send my apologies to the marine mammals which would suffer some form of disturbances rather than facing a probability on the potential damages a marine accident can cause along a heavily populated area.

The argument in which Sokos will be lost as an exclusive, private getaway for those whom have the wealth to enjoy the luxury of private boating, may I urge these privileged few to take a boarder view of the entire wellbeing of the people of the SAR than let the satisfaction of certain bourgeois aspirations and satisfaction be the overriding factor.

One can go on and on debating the merits and demerits of this proposal as there is no "Holy Grail" in satisfying everyone's minute needs and aspirations. Too often we have to deal with possibilities and probabilities in attempting to find a solution which can be acceptable to all parties. Should we all look into solutions which can lead to a more satisfying environment within feasible parameters which can be enjoyed and shared by most rather than one which are governed by mutual distrusts, cynical thoughts and selfish behaviours??

Thank you.