

# 立法會

## *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. PWSC134/08-09

(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/2

### **Public Works Subcommittee of the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 15<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held in the Conference Room A of Legislative Council Building  
on Wednesday, 10 June 2009, at 8:30 am**

#### **Members present:**

Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP (Chairman)  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP  
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH  
Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP  
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP  
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan  
Hon Paul CHAN Mo-po, MH, JP  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon Samson TAM Wai-ho, JP

**Members absent:**

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king  
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau  
Hon WONG Yuk-man

**Public officers attending:**

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Mr Joe C C WONG, JP         | Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>   |
| Mr MAK Chai-kwong, JP       | Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)  |
| Mr Raymond YOUNG, JP        | Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)   |
| Ms Anissa WONG, JP          | Permanent Secretary for the Environment  |
| Miss Sandra LAM             | Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)   |
| Ms Eva CHENG, JP            | Secretary for Transport and Housing  |
| Mr Philip YUNG Wai-hung, JP | Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) <sup>1</sup>  |
| Mr WAI Chi-sing, JP         | Director of Highways   |
| Mr WAN Man-lung, JP         | Principal Government Engineer (Railway Development), Highways Department   |
| Mr Malcolm GIBSON           | Head of Project Engineering, MTR Corporation Limited   |
| Ms Maggie SO Man-kit        | Senior Manager (Projects and Property Communications), MTR Corporation Limited   |
| Mr Vincent CHAN Po-wa       | General Manager/Financial Controller, Pypun Engineering Consultants Ltd.   |
| Mr Daniel CHUNG Kum-wah     | Deputy Project Manager (Major Works) <sup>2</sup> , Highways Department  |
| Mr Adam LAI Yu-wah          | General Manager (Planning, Development and Port Security), Marine Department   |
| Mr CHENG Hung-leung         | Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong), Transport Department   |
| Miss Amy YUEN Wai-yin       | Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) <sup>2</sup>  |
| Mr John CHAI Sung-veng, JP  | Director of Civil Engineering and Development  |
| Mr HON Chi-keung, JP        | Project Manager (Hong Kong Island and Islands), Civil Engineering and Development Department   |
| Mr Bosco CHAN Bun-pui       | Chief Engineer (Hong Kong Island and Islands Development Office) (Hong Kong) <sup>2</sup> , Civil Engineering and Development Department |
| Mr Esmond LEE Chung-sin, JP | Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) <sup>4</sup>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Mr David LAU Kum-kuen<br>Captain Michael CHAN, MBS,<br>MBB, GMSM | Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (A)<br>Controller, Government Flying Service                                  |
| Mr MA Lee-tak, JP<br>Mr NG Chi-ho                                | Director of Water Supplies<br>Assistant Director (New Works), Water<br>Supplies Department                               |
| Mr YAU Shing-mu, JP<br>Miss Rosanna LAW Shuk-pui                 | Under Secretary for Transport and Housing<br>Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and<br>Housing (Transport)2     |
| Mr TSANG King-man  | Deputy Commissioner (Planning and<br>Technical Services) (Acting), Transport<br>Department                               |
| Mr Sam WONG Chung-kwong  | Chief Engineer (Major Works)2-2, Highways<br>Department  |
| Mr LEE Yan-ming  | Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories West),<br>Transport Department   |
| Miss Ivy CHAN Ah-wing  | Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and<br>Health (Food)2 (Acting)  |
| Mr YUE Chi-hang, JP<br>Ms CHU Lan-ying                           | Director of Architectural Services<br>Assistant Director (Operations)3, Food and<br>Environmental Hygiene Department     |
| Mr Alan LO Ying-ki<br>Mrs CHUNG Lam-wai                          | Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (C)<br>Assistant Director (Management and Support),<br>Immigration Department |

**Clerk in attendance:**

|               |                              |
|---------------|------------------------------|
| Ms Debbie YAU | Chief Council Secretary (1)6 |
|---------------|------------------------------|

**Staff in attendance:**

|                  |                                   |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Mrs Constance LI | Assistant Secretary General 1     |
| Mr Simon CHEUNG  | Senior Council Secretary (1)5     |
| Ms Alice CHEUNG  | Senior Legislative Assistant (1)1 |
| Mr Frankie WOO   | Legislative Assistant (1)2        |

---

Action

The Chairman reported that a total of 116 capital works projects of an amount of \$74.255 billion had been endorsed by the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) in the 2008-2009 session so far.

**Head 708 – Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment**  
**PWSC(2009-10)50      1QR      West Island Line — funding support**

**Head 706 – Highways**

**PWSC(2009-10)51      55TR      West Island Line — essential public  
infrastructure works**

2.      The Chairman proposed and members agreed to combine the discussion and voting of the two funding proposals under PWSC(2009-10)50 and PWSC(2009-10)51 as both of them were projects related to the construction of the West Island Line (WIL). He advised that PWSC(2009-10)50 sought to upgrade 1QR to Category A at an estimated cost of \$12,252 million (in June 2009 Net Present Value) which was equivalent to \$12,252 million in money-of-the-day (MOD) prices to provide the second stage funding support for West Island Line. The second item PWSC(2009-10)51 aimed to upgrade 55TR to Category A at an estimated cost of \$103.6 million in MOD prices for the essential public infrastructure works for the West Island Line. The Administration had consulted the Subcommittee on Matters Relating to Railways (the Railways Subcommittee) on these proposals on 1 and 4 June 2009.

3.      The Chairman drew members' attention that the submission of Prof Dr Wanbil W LEE, representative of the Owners' Committee of the Belcher's, was restricted to Members and the Administration only.

4.      Ms Miriam LAU said that the Railways Subcommittee had discussed the proposal and a summary of the concerns raised was tabled for members' reference. She added that the Railways Subcommittee passed a motion at its meeting on 4 June 2009 as follows:

"That this Subcommittee strongly requests the immediate implementation of the Mass Transit Railway West Island Line project and the re-examination of its financial arrangement with the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) by the HKSAR Government as its long-term work objectives, and urges the MTRCL to re-examine the way it handles the issues in connection with the ventilation shafts and blasting works, so as to address the worries of the residents."

Construction by drill-and-blast method

5.      Ms Miriam LAU urged for the early construction of the WIL. Referring to a complaint case lodged with the Complaints Division of Legislative Council, she said that residents of the Belcher's were gravely concerned about the use of drill-and-blast method for the construction of tunnels of the WIL. They urged that the tunnels should be realigned and should not be allowed to run underneath the Belcher's. Noting that MTRCL would submit blasting assessment reports for approval before permission would be given for its carrying out blasting at any location along the alignment, Ms LAU considered that the reports would provide

assurance to the residents of the Belcher's. In this connection, she enquired whether the reports could be made available early for the residents' perusal.

6. Mr KAM Nai-wai asked whether an independent consultant could be engaged to conduct a blasting assessment and to provide reports before the meeting of the Finance Committee (FC) on 3 July 2009.

7. The Director of Highway (DH<sub>y</sub>) advised that there were altogether nine blasting assessment reports and the first draft had been submitted for the consideration of the Mines Division of the Civil Engineering Development Department (CEDD) and Buildings Department at the end of 2008 or early 2009. Based on the feedback received, MTRCL was preparing the second draft of the reports, and it would submit the reports in batches from June 2009 onward for examination by the Mines Division of CEDD. He believed that MTRCL should have adequate technical information in a few weeks' time in respect of the blasting design and mitigation measures to be taken at the location underneath the buildings of the Belcher's for sharing with the affected residents to allay their worries.

8. Mr Alan LEONG said that being one of the Members dealing with the complaint lodged by the Belcher's, he shared the concern of the affected residents. He enquired about the measures to be taken to alleviate their concerns. Mr Malcolm GIBSON, Head of Project Engineering of MTRCL assured members that MTRCL would ensure strict compliance with the regulations of the Dangerous Goods Ordinance and enforce stringent risk control and safety measures during the construction period. To minimize risks, a series of trial blasts would be carried out to assess the impact of blasting and the effectiveness of the mitigation measures aimed to protect the integrity of the buildings.

9. In reply to further enquiry of Mr Alan LEONG, DH<sub>y</sub> advised that under the requirements of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance, a risk assessment on the transport, storage and use of explosives for the project must be undertaken, and such assessment had been completed and endorsed by the relevant authorities. The EIA report of the WIL had been approved and it included a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) which showed that the risks were within the acceptable limit of risk guidelines. The QRA report was available on the website of the Environmental Protection Department for inspection by the public.

10. Mr KAM Nai-wai considered that the Administration should address the concern of residents of the Belcher's about the need for the blasting to take place just ten metres below ground level.

11. Mr Malcolm GIBSON of MTRCL clarified that the blasting would take place 10 metres away from the foundation of the Belcher's, and not 10 metres below the ground level. He assured members that there was a long history of using drill-and-blast method for excavation and construction of tunnels in rock in Hong Kong. MTRCL had over 30 years of experience in using drill-and-blast method to build underground railway stations and tunnels in densely populated areas. For

example, in extending the Tseung Kwan O Line to Hong Kong Island some years ago, blasting had taken place as close as two metres from the North Point Station which was then in operation. In the case of the Belcher's, blasting would be held at a considerable distance away from the buildings. He stressed that with stringent risk control and safety measures in place, it would be safe to carry out blasting at the proposed location.

12. Mr IP Kwok-him shared the concern of the affected residents about the adverse effect of blasting on their buildings, and enquired whether there was a mechanism for seeking compensation for damages caused by blasting.

13. DHy advised that MTRCL would maintain dialogue with residents on the project through a community liaison group comprising professional staff from Railway Development Office of the Highways Department (HyD). MTRCL would inform the community liaison group of the method and frequencies of blasting to allay the residents' concern. Moreover, MTRCL and its contractors would take out third parties insurance and liability insurance to protect the affected parties from damages and loss incurred.

14. Mrs Regina IP and Mr KAM Nai-wai enquired about the feasibility of the alternative alignment for WIL proposed by Prof Wanbil LEE. DHy explained that there were difficulties in identifying suitable sites in the densely populated Western District for the construction of the WIL. He advised that the proposed alternative alignment would necessitate the relocation of the exit/entrance at Belcher's Street to a farther location causing even more inconvenience to nearby residents. Moreover, as the proposed alignment was longer and would incur higher construction costs, it would lead to higher fares in future. Mr Malcolm GIBSON of MTRCL added that the proposed alternative alignment for the construction tunnel would clash with the foundations of other buildings and would not provide the required direct connection to the main station excavation at University station.

15. Referring to the vibration prediction formula quoted by Prof Wanbil LEE, Mr James TO considered it necessary to set a risk tolerance level to limit the vibration of the buildings of the Belcher's, which were 63-storey high. In gist, DHy explained that vibration caused by blasting would depend on the geological conditions and could be reduced by detonating explosives of different weights at different points in pre-arranged sequence, and these could be worked out carefully through a series of trial blasting. It was also not appropriate to extrapolate the empirical formula to extreme limits and to approximate a 10m distance to zero to reach an unrealistic prediction that explosive of whatever weight would cause vibrations approaching infinity. In this connection, the Chairman remarked that due to the complicated geological conditions in Hong Kong, it might not be appropriate to simply use a mathematical model to predict the vibration effect of the blasting. He said that site tests would have to be conducted for collection of data before the blast design was finalized. He urged the Administration and MTRCL to maintain communication with the affected parties to alleviate their concerns.

16. Taking note of the Administration's explanation, Mr James TO and Mr KAM Nai-wai requested that an independent blasting consultant should be engaged to assess the blast design. They also urged that the second draft of the blasting assessment reports should be made public for discussion by the relevant experts in the community. DHy advised that the Mines Division of CEDD was the authority for supervising and monitoring the use of drill-and-blast method, and that all blasting assessment reports had to be approved by the Mines Division. Mr Malcolm GIBSON of MTRCL said that MTRCL would employ an independent consultant to monitor the blasting operation throughout the construction period. He added that following the approval of the blasting assessment reports, the contractors would still need to apply to the Mines Division for a blasting licence. MTRCL would continue to communicate with the affected residents on the blasting operations and share with them at the liaison meetings essential information in the second draft of the blasting assessment reports to allay their worries.

17. In response to Mr KAM Nai-wai's enquiry about the timing for releasing the blasting assessment reports, DHy said that subject to the views of the Mines Division and the Buildings Department, MTRCL might need to amend the draft and submit further reports until these could be approved. He advised that the reports would be ready before commencement of the construction works, and he would convey to MTRCL members' request for publishing the blasting assessment reports.

18. In this connection, the Secretary for Transport and Housing (STH) advised that the blasting assessment reports would contain many technical details which might not be easily understood. She suggested presenting the essential information in the reports in layman's terms as far as possible for sharing with the residents to allay their worries.

Admin 19. Mr Albert CHAN said that it should be Government's responsibility to publicize the blasting assessment reports. STH advised that MTRCL was in the course of preparing these reports and the HyD would closely monitor this process. STH undertook to provide information before the relevant FC meeting on when and how the essential points in the blasting assessment report would be communicated to the residents concerned.

#### Ventilation shafts

20. Ms Miriam LAU relayed the objection of the Residents Concern Group for the WIL and the Belcher's concern about the location of the Hill Road ventilation shaft for the University station. These resident groups opined that as the University of Hong Kong (HKU) was a major beneficiary of the WIL, it should allow the ventilation shafts to be constructed within its campus. She urged the Administration to address local residents' concerns before the proposal was submitted to FC on 3 July 2009, with a view to easing the tension between the local residents and HKU.

21. Mr IP Kwok-him agreed that HKU should play a more proactive role in addressing the community's concern about the location and size of the ventilation shaft at Hill Road.

22. DHy responded that in deciding on the location of ventilation shafts, it would be necessary to take into account the location of the MTR stations and the related pedestrian network. To address residents' concern, MTRCL would include in the tender a requirement that the size of the ventilation openings at Hill Road should be kept as small as possible. If this could be done, some of the ventilation facilities might need to be relocated to other locations such as at the HKU.

23. Since the ventilation shaft in question was only a few metres away from the residential buildings, Mr KAM Nai-wai enquired whether it was technically feasible to do without a ventilation shaft at Hill Road. DHy advised that it would be necessary to examine the design of the station to be submitted by bidders. Mr Malcolm GIBSON of MTRCL supplemented that MTRCL had undertaken to minimize the size of the ventilation shaft at Hill Road, and this requirement would be specified in the tender document.

#### Funding arrangement

24. Mr LEE Wing-tat pointed out that the Government had in the past mainly relied on granting property development rights as the means for providing financial support to bridge the funding gap for most of the railway projects under the ownership approach. However, due to the lack of suitable sites along or adjacent to the WIL alignment for property development, the Government proposed to provide a capital grant as financial support. Mr LEE opined that the new funding arrangement was unfair as there was not much room for bargaining given that MTRCL was the only operator of railway services in the territory, and there was a genuine need to extend the existing Island Line to Kennedy Town to provide greater convenience to the commuting public. Mr LEE was concerned that the new funding arrangement might not be in the best interest of the Government and the taxpayers.

25. Mr Andrew CHENG expressed concern that the funding commitment of the Government for the WIL project would increase from \$6 billion to \$12.252 billion, whereas MTRCL's share would decrease from \$2.9 billion to \$2.7 billion. Given that there were various railway projects in the pipeline, and that WIL would bring financial benefits to other MTR lines, Mr CHENG urged the Administration to stand firm and request MTRCL to shoulder a greater share in funding the WIL and future railway extension projects.

26. STH advised that the Administration had engaged an independent engineering consultant to assess the project cost estimate done by the MTRCL. The independent consultant had concluded that MTRCL's estimate was generally in order. She explained that the funding gap was calculated by discounting and summing the estimated cost and revenue cash-flows of MTRCL arising from the



WIL project over a 50-year period. To take into account the possible fall in tender prices after the financial tsunami in late 2008 and to safeguard against overpayment of the funding support to MTRCL, the Administration would introduce a claw-back mechanism in case the actual tender prices turned out to be lower than the estimated project cost. A reassessment of the funding gap would be made, within two years after commencement of operation of WIL, on the basis of the actual contract award prices, actual fluctuation payments, actual land cost payments (paid by MTRCL for compensation, land resumption and administrative costs) and the adjusted contingency sum. The excess of the original funding support over this re-assessed amount would be returned to the Government with interest. However, if there was a shortfall, the Government would not provide additional funding to meet such shortfall. Hence, the current funding gap represented the Government's maximum financial support to the MTRCL for the WIL project. STH stressed that the proposed funding arrangements had struck a balance in bringing forward early implementation of the project while ensuring prudent use of public monies; and the project would boost economic activities and provide impetus for the rejuvenation of the Central and Western District. MTRCL would also re-provision open spaces and affected facilities (e.g. Kennedy Town Swimming Pool) in conjunction with the construction of WIL. She hoped members would understand that there would be no other organization capable of undertaking the project without the Government's financial support.

27. Mr IP Kwok-him said that the local community had looked forward to the implementation of the WIL for some twenty years. As a member of the Central and Western District Council, he urged for the early completion of the WIL. He noticed that it was common for overseas governments to subsidize the development of public transport infrastructures. As such, it would be in the interest of the public at large for the Government to bridge the funding gap for the WIL project.

28. Mr LEE Wing-tat noted with concern the drastic increase in the estimated capital cost of WIL from \$8,900 million (in January 2006 prices) to \$15,400 million (in December 2008 prices). Although the Administration had explained that the increases were mainly attributed to the increase in the scope of works for the railway and the price escalation for the construction sector since January 2006, he doubted whether the Administration had erred in its earlier estimate. In view of the drastic cost increase, Mr LEE considered that the Administration should seriously review the funding arrangements.

29. STH explained that in addition to cost escalation in the construction sector since January 2006, some substantial changes in the scope of the project had also been introduced as a result of the detailed planning, design ground investigation and further public consultation in the past three years. In the current financial analysis, the Administration had taken into account revenue cash-flows of MTRCL arising from the WIL project over a 50-year period, including the projected patronage and revenue brought to other MTR lines as a result of the commissioning of WIL. She considered the proposed claw-back mechanism and the funding ceiling mentioned above adequate and appropriate to safeguard the

Government's and the public's interest.

30. Referring to the motion passed by the Railways Subcommittee at the meeting on 4 June 2009, Mr Andrew CHENG was disappointed that as reflected in PWSC(2009-2010)50, the Administration had not paid due consideration to members' request of reviewing the financial arrangements with MTRCL.

Admin 31. Miss Tanya CHAN expressed concern about the risks to be borne by the Government under the proposed funding arrangement for the construction of WIL. She requested the Administration to provide further information on the projected patronage (including projected population for the areas concerned), fare structure (including concessionary fares, if any), and also the fare and non-fare revenue.

32. STH advised that subsequent to the meeting of the Railways Subcommittee on 4 June 2009, the Administration had deposited at the Legislative Council Secretariat a set of the Final Report of the Consultancy for the Checking of the Estimated Construction and Operation Costs of the WIL. As the consultancy report contained cost-sensitive and confidential information, an executive summary had also been made available for members' easy reference.

Admin (Post-meeting note : After the meeting, Miss Tanya CHAN requested the Administration to provide more information on the input assumptions of the computer model run showing the projected patronage in 2021 including projected land use data (e.g. population and employment figures) fare structure, value of time of the passengers, GDP data, highway network data and other public transport data for various design years.)

33. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed concern that the Government had to shoulder a greater share of the capital funding of WIL and the burden would have to be placed on the taxpayers. He considered that MTRCL should assume social responsibility and offer more concessionary fares for MTR passengers. In particular, he called on MTRCL to extend the existing \$2 elderly concessionary fare for senior citizens to include Sundays, in addition to Wednesdays.

34. Ms Maggie SO of MTRCL advised that MTRCL was well aware of the call from the public for more fare concessions. MTRCL had reviewed the provision of concessionary fare schemes from time to time. At present, MTR passengers were benefiting from fare reduction with an annual saving of about \$1.1 billion each year, with the operation of the concessionary fare scheme for senior citizens, the Student Travel Scheme and the Fare Saver discounts currently offered by MTRCL. While the existing concessionary fare for the elderly would continue until the end of August 2009, MTRCL would examine the feasibility of different kinds of promotion, having regard to customer demand, market situation, business operation and commissioning of new railway lines.

35. Mr Albert CHAN said that while Members belonging to the League of Social Democrats supported the provision of mass transportation systems for the

public, they objected to the current proposal because of the Administration's lopsided policy on railway development and the lack of effective monitoring of railway projects. He opined that the capital grant for WIL and other railway projects including South Island Line, Shatin-Central Link and Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail were tantamount to transfer of benefits of over HK\$100 billion from the Government to MTRCL. Mr CHAN urged members to be vigilant in scrutinizing the funding proposal.

#### Policy on railway development

36. Mr Albert CHAN criticized that the Administration's policy on railway development was in favour of certain districts in the urban areas, particular those on the Hong Kong Island. He said that despite the growth of population in the New Territories west and repeated urge from the local community, the Administration had no plan to extend the MTR railway line from Tsuen Wan to Tuen Mun. Moreover, the Administration had not reasonably assessed the impact of railway developments on the operation of other transport modes, such as buses, taxis and public light buses. Mr CHAN requested the Administration to appoint an independent consultant to review the current railway policy and its impacts.

37. STH said that the Railway Development Strategy 2000 had laid down a comprehensive framework for railway development in Hong Kong, including projects which would benefit the New Territories, such as the Northern Link which would link up the East Rail Line and the West Rail Line. The Administration was also considering if a midway station for the Hong Kong-Shenzhen Airport Rail Link at Hung Shui Kiu should be provided to cater for the needs of residents living in northwest of New Territories.

#### Land acquisition and provision of public housing in Central and Western Districts

38. Ms Cyd HO pointed out that, while the WIL project had brought about transport benefits and convenience to the travelling public, it would also lead to an increase in rentals in the areas along the WIL. As there was a lack of public housing in Central and Western Districts to accommodate eligible clearers of the households affected by land acquisition under the WIL project, Ms HO urged the Administration to speed up the provision of more public housing estates for the areas, as supported by the Central and Western District Council.

39. STH advised that the provision of public housing was subject to availability of suitable sites, competition of land use for other purposes and if necessary, approval by the Town Planning Board for the zoning changes. She was grateful for the support of the Central and Western District Council for more public housing development in the district. The Housing Department would be working to see if more public housing could be provided in the district. Ms Cyd HO said that the shortage of public housing in the Central and Western District had remained unresolved since the WIL project was proposed in 2005, and the Administration should step up efforts in this regard.

40. Ms Cyd HO noted that the Administration would resume underground strata of land for the construction of WIL and enquired how the estimated compensation of \$380 million (in December 2007 prices) for the loss of redevelopment potential arising from the underground strata resumption was calculated. She said that the Administration seemed to give more attention to compensate the interests of private owners which might suffer loss of redevelopment potential but was slow to provide public housing to those who might have to be resited.

Admin

41. The Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)<sup>1</sup> explained that an amount of \$380 million was reserved which was only an estimate and the actual cost was subject to the details of claims submitted by the persons having compensable interest, if there were such claims. The amount was estimated on the assumption of potential claims from private developments the approved plot ratio of land had not yet been fully utilized and future redevelopment might be affected by the underground strata resumption. At the request of Ms Cyd HO, the Administration agreed to provide, before the relevant FC meeting, the list of private developments along the underground strata to be resumed.

42. As members raised no further question, the Chairman put the two items to vote. Fourteen members voted for the proposals, one member voted against it and five members abstained from voting. The individual results were as follows:

*For :*

|                   |                    |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| Mr Alan LEONG     | Mr CHAN Kam-lam    |
| Mr LAU Wong-fat   | Ms Miriam LAU      |
| Mr Timothy FOK    | Mr TAM Yiu-chung   |
| Mr WONG Kwok-hing | Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming |
| Mr CHAN Hak-kan   | Miss Tanya CHAN    |
| Mr WONG Kwok-kin  | Mr IP Kwok-him     |
| Mrs Regina IP     | Dr Samson TAM      |

(14 members)

*Against :*

Mr Albert CHAN  
(1 member)

*Abstain:*

|                         |                     |
|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Mr Fred LI Wah-ming     | Mr James TO Kun-sun |
| Mr Andrew CHENG Kar-foo | Mr KAM Nai-wai      |
| Ms Cyd HO Sau-lan       |                     |

(5 members)

43. The two items were endorsed. Mr Alan LEONG requested that the item PWSC(2008-09)50 be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

**PWSC(2009-10)52    579TH    Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link**

44.    The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 579TH to Category A at an estimated cost of \$28,104.6 million in MOD prices for the construction of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass and Island Eastern Corridor Link. The Panel on Development had been consulted on the proposal at the meeting on 26 May 2009 and Panel members supported the proposal. At the request of the Panel, the Administration had provided further information on the temporary traffic arrangement proposal during the construction of the Trunk Road.

45.    The item was voted on and endorsed.

**Head 707 – New Towns and Urban Area Development**

**PWSC(2009-10)53    677CL    Wan Chai development phase II, engineering works**

46.    The Chairman advised members that the proposal was to upgrade 677CL to Category A at an estimated cost of \$4,642.7 million in MOD prices for implementation of the Wan Chai development phase II. The Panel on Development had been consulted on the proposal at the meeting on 26 May 2009, and Panel members in general supported the funding proposal.

47.    The item was voted on and endorsed.

**PWSC(2009-10)54    67GI    Development of Government Helipad at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre**

48.    The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 67G1 to Category A at an estimated cost of \$59.1 million in MOD prices for the construction of a permanent government helipad at the north-eastern end of the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre. The Panel on Development had been consulted on the proposal at the meeting on 26 May 2009, and Panel members had not raised objection to the funding proposal.

49.    The item was voted on and endorsed.

**Head 709 – Waterworks**

**PWSC(2009-10)55    43WS    Upgrading of Wan Chai salt water supply system**

50.    The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 43WS to Category A at an estimated cost of \$271.1 million in MOD prices for the upgrading of Wan Chai salt water supply system. An information paper on the proposal had

been circulated to the Panel on Development on 20 May 2009.

51. The item was voted on and endorsed.

### **Head 706 – Highways**

#### **PWSC(2009-10)48 28TC Speed map panels in the New Territories**

52. The Chairman advised that the project was to upgrade 28TC to Category A at an estimated cost of \$70.9 million in MOD prices for the construction of Speed Map Panels in the New Territories. The Panel on Transport had been consulted on the proposal at the meeting on 20 March 2009, and Panel members supported the proposal.

53. The item was voted on and endorsed.

#### **PWSC(2009-10)49 836TH Improvement to Sham Tseng Interchange**

54. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 836TH to Category A at an estimated cost of \$99.6 million in MOD prices for the improvement of Sham Tseng Interchange. An information note on the proposal had been circulated to the Panel on Transport on 18 May 2009.

55. The item was voted on and endorsed.

### **Head 703 – Buildings**

#### **PWSC(2009-10)47 12NT Conversion of aqua privies into flushing toilets — phase 6**

56. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 12NT to Category A at an estimated cost of \$221.1 million in MOD prices for the conversion of aqua privies into flushing toilets. The Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene had been consulted on the proposal at its meeting on 12 May 2009, and Panel members supported the proposal.

57. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming expressed support for the funding proposal. He said that there had been substantial improvement to the toilet facilities in the New Territories and outlying islands following the completion of the first four phases of the improvement programme. He noted that the target completion date for phases 6 and 7 would be 2012-2013. Since improvement works to the aqua privies were small-scale projects, he wondered whether it was possible to start works of all privies at the same time, in order to bring forward the completion date. He also asked whether septic tanks would continue to be used for areas not provided with public sewage until the public sewage was available to these areas.

58. The Director of Architectural Services (D Arch S) advised that based on the experience of the first five phases, the target completion date for phase 6 was a realistic one. Nevertheless, if the conversion works had to start earlier for aqua privies in certain locations, the Administration would seek the views of District Councils concerned. The Assistant Director (Operations)3 (AD(Ops)3) supplemented that the type of improvements for aqua privies would depend on the availability of public sewer and the site conditions. The Architectural Services Department would liaise with the Drainage Services Department to ascertain availability of public sewage for these aqua privies. For those which did not have public sewage in the vicinity, holding tanks or bio-treatment system would continue to be used for the time being.

59. Miss Tanya CHAN enquired whether emergency call bells could be installed for these toilets after conversion. AD(Ops)3 advised that the Administration had no plan to install emergency call bells in these toilets, in view of their relatively low utilization. Miss CHAN requested the Administration to consider installing emergency call bells in all public toilets in the future.

60. Mr WONG Kwok-hing asked about the number of aqua privies left following the completion of phase 7. He also asked whether the Administration could advance the conversion project so as to create employment. AD(Ops)3 advised that phases 6 and 7 would cover 90 and 200 toilets respectively, and the whole conversion project would be completed after phase 7. She added that the completion date of the project had been advanced for about six months to 2012-13.

61. The item was voted on and endorsed.

**PWSC(2009-10)32 60JA Construction of rank and file quarters for Immigration Department at Wo Yi Hop Road, Kwai Chung**

62. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade 60JA to Category A at an estimated cost of \$275 million in MOD prices for the construction of rank and file quarters for the Immigration Department at Wo Yi Hop Road, Kwai Chung. The Panel on Security had been consulted on the proposal at the meeting on 7 April 2009, and Panel members did not raise any objection to the proposal.

63. The item was voted on and endorsed.

64. The meeting ended at 10:24 am.