

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(4)334/14-15  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/EDEV+CB1/PL/EA

**Panel on Economic Development and Panel on Environmental Affairs**

**Minutes of joint meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 30 September 2014, at 4:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Members of the Panel on Economic Development

Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP  
\* Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon YIU Si-wing  
\* Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
\* Hon Dennis KWOK  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP  
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP

Members of the Panel on Environmental Affairs

Hon Cyd HO, JP (Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok

\* Also members of the Panel on Environmental Affairs

**Member attending** : Hon Alan LEONG Ka-kit, SC

**Members absent:** Members of the Panel on Economic Development

Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC  
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau  
\* Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
\* Hon Steven HO Chun-yin  
\* Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming  
\* Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
\* Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
\* Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan

Members of the Panel on Environmental Affairs

Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

**Public Officers** : Transport and Housing Bureau  
**Attending**

Mr YAU Shing-mu, JP  
Under Secretary for Transport and Housing

Mr Andy YAU, JP  
Head (Airport Expansion Project Coordination Office)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr TANG Kin-fai, JP  
Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

**Attendance by Invitation : Agenda item II**

Mr NG Chi-kee  
Acting Chief Executive Officer  
Airport Authority Hong Kong

Mr Wilson FUNG  
Executive Director, Corporate Development  
Airport Authority Hong Kong

Mr Kevin POOLE  
Deputy Director, Projects  
Airport Authority Hong Kong

Mr Peter LEE  
General Manager, Environment (Projects)  
Airport Authority Hong Kong

Ms Stephanie LI  
Chief Adviser  
Airport Authority Hong Kong

*Session One*

Mr LEE Man-kwong  
Membership Affairs Officer  
Hong Kong Air Cargo Terminals Employees Union

Mr LI Wing-foo  
Chairman  
Hong Kong Airport Ramp Services Employees Union

Mr WONG Man-kuen  
Coordinator  
Airport Air Freight Employees Association

Mr FU Ka-ho  
Member  
九龍塘大學社會政策學系機場三跑道系統關注組

Mr Michael MO  
Spokesperson  
Airport Development Concern Network

Mr SUN Wai-kei  
The Vice Spokesperson for the Youth Affairs  
Business and Professionals Alliance for  
Hong Kong

Mr LAM Chiu-ying

Mr Thomas TUE  
CEO  
ECO Association

Ms Sylvia LEE

Ms CHAN Chiu-lan

Ms KWOK Suk-kwan

Miss Shirley WONG

Miss YU Hin-pik

Session Two

Mr Jason WONG  
Vice Chairman  
International Chinese Tourist Association

Mr TSANG Wing-hang  
Vice President  
The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in  
Hong Kong

余莉華女士  
主席  
香港專業導遊總工會

Ms HO Loy  
Member  
Save Lantau Alliance

Mr Stanley KAN Ho-yin  
Director, Service Delivery  
Hong Kong Airlines

<b>Clerk in attendance</b>	:	Ms Debbie YAU Chief Council Secretary (4)5
<b>Staff in attendance</b>	:	Ms Shirley TAM Senior Council Secretary (4)5
		Ms Anki NG Council Secretary (4)5
		Miss Mandy NG Council Secretary (4)3
		Miss Mandy POON Legislative Assistant (1)1
		Ms PANG Yin-shan Clerical Assistant (1)1

---

Action

**I. Election of Chairman**

Ms Cyd HO, Chairman of the Panel on Environmental Affairs, informed members that as Mr James TIEN, Chairman of the Panel on Economic Development, was unable to attend this meeting, she would be the Chairman of the joint meeting ("the Chairman") to receive public views on the proposed Three-Runway System ("3RS") project for the Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA") and the relevant Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") report.

**II. Receiving public views on the Third Runway Project in the Hong Kong International Airport and the relevant Environmental Impact Assessment Report**

Meeting arrangements for the public hearing sessions

2. The Chairman said that due to special circumstances affecting public's access to the Legislative Council ("LegCo") Complex, the public hearing sessions originally scheduled for 29 September 2014 had to be rescheduled. Two dates, namely, 7 and 13 October 2014 had been proposed. The Chairman said that as the 2014-2015 legislative session would commence on 8 October 2014, if the rescheduled public hearing session(s) could not be arranged on 7 October 2014, the relevant arrangements would have to be determined by the elected Chairmen of the two Panels for the new session of 2014-2015.

Motions to be proposed by Dr Kenneth CHAN

3. Dr Kenneth CHAN said that he had indicated his intention to move two motions related to the proposed 3RS project and the EIA report (LC Paper No. CB(4)1090/13-14(02)) after the public hearing sessions. In the event that the other public hearing session(s) was/were to be held in the new legislative session, he would make fresh requests to the new Panel Chairmen in the next session.

4. Mr SIN Chung-kai supported Dr CHAN's suggestion in dealing with the two motions. He said that arrangements should also be made for those deputations, which had registered but were not able to attend the current meeting, to join the public hearing session(s) being rescheduled to present their views.

Meeting with deputations and the Administration

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1626/13-14(03) - Administration's paper on the updates on the Three-Runway System Project at the Hong Kong International Airport

LC Paper No. CB(1)1626/13-14(04) - Paper on the development of a third runway at the Hong Kong International Airport prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (background brief)

LC Paper No. CB(4)1073/13-14(01) - Extract of draft minutes of meeting of the Panel on Economic Development held on 23 June 2014 (English version only)

LC Paper No. CB(4)1090/13-14(02) - Letter dated 25 September 2014 from Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok to the Chairmen of Panel on Economic Development and Panel on Environmental Affairs (with wording of two motions attached) (Chinese version only)

- LC Paper No. CB(4)1101/13-14(01) - Letter from the Advisory Council on the Environment in response to the motions to be moved by Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
- LC Paper No. CB(1)1693/13-14(01) - Letter dated 20 June 2014 from Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip requesting discussion on the Environmental Impact Assessment Report on the Three-Runway System project at the Hong Kong International Airport (Chinese version only)
- Environmental Impact Assessment report - [http://www.epd.gov.hk/eia/register/report/eiareport/eia\\_2232014/html/index.htm](http://www.epd.gov.hk/eia/register/report/eiareport/eia_2232014/html/index.htm))

## **Session One**

### Presentation of views by deputation

5. At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of 13 deputations/individuals presented their views on the proposed 3RS project in HKIA and the relevant EIA report. A summary of the views of these deputations/ individuals was in the **Annex**.

### Response by the Administration

6. At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for Transport and Housing ("USTH") said that the Administration and Airport Authority Hong Kong ("AAHK") were aware of some of the comments raised by deputations on various occasions and having examined their concerns and suggestions, AAHK had proposed mitigation measures as required under the EIA process. Subject to the views of the Advisory Council on the Environment ("ACE") and the approval of the Director of Environmental Protection, AAHK would implement the measures to be incorporated in the Environmental Permit for the 3RS project.

7. Assistant Director (Environment Assessment) ("AD(EA)") said that the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") had received the EIA report on 3RS from AAHK on 17 April 2014, and it was made

available for public inspection for 30 days between 20 June and 19 July 2014 in accordance with the EIA Ordinance. Thereafter, AAHK consulted ACE over a period of 60 days. ACE held a meeting on 15 September 2014 and gave its comments on the EIA report to the Director of Environmental Protection ("DEP") on 19 September 2014. If no further information was requested, DEP was required, within 30 days of the receipt of comments from ACE, i.e. by 17 October 2014, to decide whether the EIA report for the 3RS project should be approved.

## Discussion

### *Runway capacity*

8. Mr YIU Si-wing commented that HKIA at Chek Lap Kok, being commissioned for use since 1998, played a pivotal role in contributing to Hong Kong's economy. According to his understanding, the industries that relied on HKIA's efficient flow of people and goods accounted for almost 60% of Hong Kong's Gross Domestic Product ("GDP") and supported almost half of the jobs directly or indirectly created in Hong Kong. The proposed 3RS project was essential to maintain Hong Kong's competitive edge in the region's airports, such as those in Shenzhen, Shanghai, Beijing and Singapore, which were outgrowing HKIA.

9. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr LAM Chiu-ying commented that there had been some discussions on whether the existing two runways in HKIA could handle a maximum of 68 or 86 ATMs. Mr LAM said that the Aviation Policy and Research Centre of the Chinese University of Hong Kong had conducted investigation and published research report on this subject in 2007. The then Deputy Chairman of the Cathay Pacific Airways Limited, Mr Philip CHEN, had also mentioned that the capacity of HKIA's runway could be increased to 75 ATMs per hour by implementing improvement measures that were found feasible. Mr LAM added that HKIA was originally designed to be able to cope with an annual demand for cargo volume of 9 million tonnes and passenger traffic of some 87 million. He opined that there was sufficient space and infrastructure available in HKIA to meet the design capacity without having to build a third runway. Moreover, the planning parameters at that time had not taken into consideration the latest development of information technology and other technological advancement that could increase runway capacity. Mr LAM stressed that cargo traffic could not be a reason for the construction of the third runway.



10. Mr YIU Si-wing asked if the Administration and AAHK had considered the comments made by Mr LAM Chiu-ying. If Mr LAM's suggestions were to be taken on board, Mr YIU asked to what extent the handling capacity of passengers and freight could be increased, and by how long HKIA could operate before reaching saturation. He considered that the Administration and AAHK should respond whether Hong Kong's anticipated economic growth in the next couple of decades or longer could be supported by implementing improvement measures to HKIA's operations as suggested by Mr LAM Chiu-ying without having to construct the third runway.

11. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK responded that the current two-runway system ("2RS") at HKIA could handle a maximum of 68 air traffic movements ("ATMs") per hour which was verified by the Civil Aviation Department ("CAD") and endorsed by independent consultants with expertise in the field. While there might be some rooms for expanding HKIA's runway capacity through improvements in airport operation, any measure to be introduced must comply with international safety standards as imposed by the International Civil Aviation Organization ("ICAO"). Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK acknowledged Mr LAM Chiu-ying's comments that the design of HKIA allowed it to handle the growth in cargo volume anticipated in 1992. For this reason, AAHK was not proposing any new cargo terminal in the 3RS project. He reiterated that the bottleneck of the existing HKIA rested with runway capacity and therefore 3RS was required to cope with the latest anticipated growth in air traffic.

12. Mr Gary FAN and Mr Michael MO, spokesperson of the Airport Development Concern Network, commented that the 1992 New Airport Master Plan ("the 1992 NAMP") had estimated that the two runways of HKIA could handle between 82 and 86 ATMs per hour. If this capacity could be achieved, the need for the third runway would not be justified as the annual demand by 2030 was estimated to be 607 000 ATMs. In the Hong Kong International Airport Master Plan 2030 Study ("HKIA Master Plan 2030"), it was pointed out that under the two-runway system, the practical maximum runway capacity of HKIA only reached 68 ATMs per hour. Given the wide discrepancy in the two assessments, Mr FAN and Mr MO queried whether the public could trust the current claim in HKIA Master Plan 2030 that the maximum capacity of the proposed 3RS could reach 102 ATMs per hour.

13. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK responded that the 1992 NAMP was only a masterplan at strategic level and not meant to be a technical flight path study. The 1992 NAMP suggested that high runway capacity (i.e. 86 ATMs per hour) of HKIA could be achieved under an independent mixed mode of operations (i.e. aircraft departures and arrivals could take place on each of the runways independently). However, the presence of Lantau Island to the south of HKIA had imposed physical constraints on the design of flight paths and procedures by CAD that ruled out independent mixed mode of operations; and the adoption of such mode might not meet ICAO's safety requirements.

14. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK further advised that the 1992 NAMP had already concluded that 86 ATMs per hour was not feasible under the existing two-runway system in HKIA. Independent studies had been conducted by the Administration and AAHK in 1994 and 1998 respectively to explore the maximum capacity of the existing two runways that could be achieved. The 1994 study indicated that 63 ATMs per hour was possible while the 1998 study identified some 49 enhancement measures that could be implemented to increase the capacity of the two runways of HKIA to 68 ATMs per hour. Such findings had the endorsement of CAD.

*(Post meeting note: AAHK clarified that one of the independent studies was conducted in 2008 instead of 1998, and that the studies had introduced 46 enhancement measures instead of 49.)*

15. Mr Gary FAN asked the Administration to provide information about the practical maximum runway capacity of the two runways at HKIA per hour as set out in the 1992 NAMP, and the reports of the 1994 and 1998\* studies, including details of the 49\* improvement measures to increase the runway capacity. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK undertook to provide the information as requested.

Admin

*(Post meeting note:\*should be 2008 and 46, as clarified by AAHK.)*

16. In this connection, Mr LAM Chiu-ying noted that AAHK had recently declined the request of the Hong Kong Institute of Planners for a copy of the 1992 NAMP, indicating that the document was unavailable.

17. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK clarified that the 1992 NAMP was available on the AAHK's website and in its library for public reference.

(*Post meeting note:* AAHK clarified that the 1992 NAMP was available in the public libraries and the 2008 report has been posted on AAHK's website for viewing by members of the public.)

18. As regards Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK's explanation that the Lantau terrain imposed a constraint on aircraft movements, Mr Michael MO said that the 1992 NAMP had already suggested that consideration should be given to removing the terrains of two peaks, namely Tai Yam Teng and Fa Peng Teng in the northeast Lantau Island, when operational demand of HKIA required increasing capacity provided for independent departures. Mr MO commented that the design of HKIA's two runways already allowed an independent mixed mode of operations. He also believed that new aviation technologies were emerging which would allow air movements of the two existing runways to be increased without contravening ICAO's safety requirements.

19. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK remarked that it was a mis-reading of the 1992 NAMP to conclude that terrain removal of two peaks in Lantau Island would help increase runway capacity. He clarified that terrain removal could only reduce the gradient of aircrafts taking off from the runways under special circumstances, such that AAHK could reduce their payload restrictions but it could not remove completely the constraints that prohibited the two runways from operating in an independent mixed mode. The relevant considerations for terrain removal were stated clearly in the 1992 NAMP.

*Airspace restriction and the problem of "air wall"*

20. Mr Gary FAN commented that the existing "air wall" restrictions (i.e. the requirement imposed by Mainland authorities that an aircraft departing from Hong Kong must reach an altitude of over 15 700 feet before it entered the Mainland airspace) in the use of Mainland airspace as pointed out by deputations had limited the practical maximum capacity of HKIA's two runways. Mr FAN expressed concern that unless the problem of "air wall" could be solved, the effectiveness of the proposed 3RS in expanding the runway capacity to 102 ATMs per hour remained very doubtful. He asked what measures the Administration and AAHK would adopt to tackle the issue.

21. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK explained that given the close proximity between HKIA and its Shenzhen counterpart, the requirement for aircrafts departing from HKIA to reach certain designated altitude

would in fact improve rather than lower the efficiency in the management of airspace utilization. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK added that CAD had also pointed out on various occasions that the airspace restrictions would not impact on the runway capacity of HKIA.

22. Mr Michael MO said that he had requested the Administration and AAHK to provide relevant documents regarding the details of regional co-operation on airspace management among the civil aviation authorities of the Mainland, Hong Kong and Macao. However, the Administration and AAHK first denied the existence of such documents, but later indicated that such documents could not even be released to AAHK's board members. Without proper documentary evidence, Mr MO doubted the ability of the Administration and AAHK to solve the "air wall" problem of airspace restriction by the time when 3RS came into operation.

23. Mr LAM Chiu-ying highlighted that according to an expert who was well-versed about the aviation situation in Hong Kong, the current airspace restrictions would indeed affect the permissible number of aircraft movements in each of HKIA's two runways.

24. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK said that CAD had been discussing with the Civil Aviation Administration of China and the Macao Civil Aviation Authority to enhance the management of the Pearl River Delta ("PRD") airspace. The tripartite working group, which had been established in 2004, had reached consensus on the target and measures relating to the planning of optimizing the PRD airspace structure by 2020. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK stressed that the "air wall" would only affect the altitude at which departing aircrafts entered the airspace of the Mainland, but it had no impact on the capacity of the two runways.

*Use of wide-bodied aircrafts*

25. Mr Gary FAN noted with concern that some of the present air movements at HKIA were taken up by more narrow-bodied aircrafts serving secondary destinations in the Mainland, and these aircrafts carried lower passenger and/or cargo loads than wide-bodied ones serving international routes. For instance, the number of passengers per movement in 2013 was just 192, which was less than 314 as previously envisaged. This arrangement had undermined the passenger and cargo throughputs of HKIA and did not optimize the deployment of the existing two-runway system. Mr FAN commented that higher passenger and cargo throughputs could be achieved if air service operators would be

encouraged to deploy bigger aircrafts for use at HKIA (such as by imposing a surcharge on smaller aircrafts) without the need for the third runway.

26. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK explained that about 63% of the aircrafts using HKIA were wide-bodied models, and the passenger and cargo volume carried by each aircraft departing from HKIA were among the highest in the world. He explained that air service was a high-cost business and HKIA was already very busy. The suggestion of imposing a peak-hour surcharge on small aircrafts would not be effective to encourage airlines to deploy bigger aircrafts, the choice of which was primarily market-driven.

#### *Conservation of Chinese White Dolphins*

27. Mr YIU Si-wing noted the various marine ecology measures proposed to be implemented by AAHK. He asked whether the Administration could ensure that the proposed 2 400 hectares of marine park would be designated in time for the relocation of the Chinese White Dolphins ("CWDs") before the construction works under the 3RS project commenced, and whether the measures would really be effective in conserving CWDs that would be affected by the construction activities in the waters around HKIA.

28. USTH advised that if the designation of the marine park was eventually incorporated as a condition in the Environmental Permit for the 3RS project, relevant Government departments and AAHK would work hand-in-hand to ensure the timely implementation of the marine park for the conservation of CWDs.

#### *Compensatory measures for residents of Park Island in Ma Wan*

29. The Chairman asked if compensatory measures would be provided to residents of Park Island in Ma Wan who might be affected by the increased aircraft noise when 3RS was in operation. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK said that according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, domestic premises should not be located within specific Noise Exposure Forecast ("NEF") contours. The NEF standard applicable to HKIA was NEF 25 contour in respect of domestic premises. Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK further explained that as indicated in the EIA report of the 3RS project, the areas covered within NEF 25 contour of HKIA under a 3RS scenario did not include Park Island in Ma Wan.

30. The Chairman declared that the first session of the public hearing session was closed, and the second session would commence in five minutes' time.

## **Session Two**

### Presentation of views by deputation

31. At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of five deputations presented their views on the proposed 3RS project in HKIA and the relevant EIA report. A summary of the views of these deputations was in the **Annex**.

### Response by AAHK

32. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Peter LEE of AAHK and Mr Wilson FUNG of AAHK gave the following responses to the concerns expressed by the deputations in Session Two:

- (a) according to the EIA report, when 3RS came into operation, the South Runway could be put on standby mode between 11:00 pm to 7:00 am on the following day. As the distance between Tung Chung and the nearest operating runway would be increased from the existing 1.5 to two kilometres to more than three kilometres, the aircraft noise impact on Tung Chung would be greatly alleviated;
- (b) same as Tung Chung, Park Island in Ma Wan at present was located outside NEF 25 contour, and hence the aircraft noise level there was considered acceptable. With further technological advancement, new generation aircrafts were expected to be quieter and the aircraft noise impact in North Lantau and Park Island in Ma Wan would be lower than the level forecast in the EIA report. Under the Aircraft Noise Monitoring and Audit Requirements, prediction verification on the effectiveness of measures to mitigate aircraft noise impact of the project would be undertaken upon availability of relevant airport operation data for the first full year operation of the proposed 3RS. If the comparison of contours showed discrepancies, explanation should be given and analyzed. It was essential to ensure that no additional

noise sensitive receivers would be subject to excessive aircraft noise impact;

- (c) the air quality assessment of the EIA study on the 3RS project was conducted based on the latest EURO VI emission standard for vehicles, while the EIA study for the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge was based on the EURO V emission standard, with the former up to 50% more stringent than the latter in terms of emission reduction from vehicles. Together with a number of initiatives already put in place to minimize emissions of air pollutants, the pollutants level in Tung Chung was expected to be lower at the time when 3RS was commissioned; and
- (d) the principle of AAHK to develop the infrastructure of HKIA was to match with the pace of growth in passenger and cargo traffic volume. Under the 1992 NAMP, it was anticipated that HKIA would need 148 parking stands in 2015. However, the actual air traffic demand at HKIA was greater than forecast, and the expansion plan was subsequently adjusted accordingly. Upon completion of the Midfield Development Project by the end of 2015, the number of parking stands at HKIA would reach 178.

## Discussion

### *Conservation of Chinese White Dolphins*

33. Mr YIU Si-wing opined that Hong Kong was facing intensifying competition from neighbouring airports in Shenzhen, Macao and Guangzhou in light of their committed airport expansion plans. He agreed that there was an urgent need for 3RS to maintain Hong Kong's status as an important regional and international aviation hub and a transit gateway for passengers travelling between the Mainland and overseas destinations.

34. Noting that one of the major environmental concerns of 3RS was about conservation of CWDs and according to the EIA report, a new marine park of approximately 2 400 hectares would be designated to connect HKIA Approach Areas and the existing/planned marine parks at Sha Chau/Lung Kwu Chau and The Brothers, Mr YIU Si-wing expressed concern whether the new marine park could effectively conserve the habitats of CWDs. He relayed the criticism of some green groups that

their views and recommendations to conserve CWDs were often ignored by the Administration and AAHK. He enquired whether the Administration had taken heed of the proposed measures or suggested alternative solutions to address the concerns.

35. Mr Peter LEE of AAHK said that AAHK had initiated in the EIA report compensatory, mitigation and enhancement measures to conserve CWDs, including using non-dredge method for land formation, designation of approximately 2 400 hectares of a new marine park and establishment of a marine ecology enhancement fund. AD(EA) clarified that the designation of Southwest Lantau Marine Park and Soko Islands Marine Park, as recently announced by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department had no connection with the new 2400 hectares marine park recommended by AAHK in the EIA report.

Admin 36. Acknowledging the need to enhance the runway capacity of HKIA to keep up with the rising demand, USTH advised that AAHK had engaged stakeholders to address public concerns of the potential environmental impacts of the 3RS project. USTH stressed that AAHK had adopted certain conservative measures raised by green groups, for instance, designation of marine parks, imposing route diversion and speed limit of high speed ferries operating at SkyPier. Mr YIU Si-wing requested the Administration to provide written information on the measures proposed to be implemented to address the environmental impact concerns raised by the green groups and the reasons for not addressing some of such concerns.

*Tracking studies of the EIA report*

37. The Chairman expressed concern whether the Administration would conduct tracking studies on the compensatory, mitigation and enhancement measures, as stated in the EIA report for implementation by AAHK, to evaluate their effectiveness. The Chairman quoted the report submitted by the LegCo Subcommittee on Issues Relating to Air, Noise and Light Pollution which pointed out that the Administration/project proponent should decide on the methodology for conducting a review on respective EIA report of the project concerned to ensure that the mitigation measures as set out in the relevant EIA report had been properly implemented.

38. In reply, USTH advised that AAHK had conducted the EIA process in accordance with the EIA Ordinance, and achieved standards beyond existing statutory requirements. Mr Peter LEE of AAHK



Admin

advised that after 3RS came into operation, AAHK would carry out aircraft noise monitoring and audit plan which included, inter alia, a Noise Contour Report prepared at least every five years to compare actual airport operation to forecast airport operation with respect to aircraft noise taking into account data collected on actual aircraft operational levels, fleet mix, runway and flight track utilizations. The need and feasibility of introducing additional mitigation measures would be assessed to ensure that no adverse environmental impact would be resulted from the implementation of the project with respect to aircraft noise. At the request of the Chairman, the Administration undertook to put in place a mechanism to ensure that the measures taken by AAHK as set out in the EIA report would be effective and properly implemented during and after the construction of 3RS.

**III. Any other business**

39. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 7:10 pm.

Council Business Division 4  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
9 January 2015

**Panel on Economic Development and Panel on Environmental Affairs**

**Joint meeting on Tuesday, 30 September 2014, at 4:30 pm  
Meeting to receive views on "Third Runway Project in the Hong Kong International Airport  
and the relevant Environmental Impact Assessment Report"**

**Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individuals**

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
<b><u>Session One</u></b>		
1.	Hong Kong Air Cargo Terminals Employees Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expressed support for the Three-Runway System ("3RS") project in the Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA").</li> <li>● Trusted that the mitigation measures proposed in the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") report should minimize the environmental impact of the 3RS project.</li> <li>● The commissioning of the third runway would help reduce carbon emissions and noise impacts in Tung Chung area.</li> <li>● The construction of the third runway would enable HKIA to cope with the growth in freight, help maintain Hong Kong's competitive edge in the region and safeguard the job openings concerned.</li> </ul>
2.	Hong Kong Airport Ramp Services Employees Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expressed support for the 3RS project in HKIA.</li> <li>● Agreed that the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA report could minimize the environmental impact of the 3RS project.</li> <li>● The proposed 3RS project would provide employment opportunities, help promote Hong Kong's social and economic development, and would help maintain Hong Kong's competitiveness in the region.</li> <li>● The proposed 3RS project would improve freight handling efficiency and increase the capacity of HKIA.</li> <li>● The deployment of larger aircraft to meet the growing freight demand did not rest with HKIA but the airlines.</li> </ul>
3.	Airport Air Freight Employees' Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LC Paper No. CB(4)163/14-15(01) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
4.	九龍塘大學社會政策學系機場三跑道系統關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expressed concern that the public consultation period of the EIA report lasting for 30 days was too short.</li> <li>● Many green groups had raised concerns on the adverse environmental impacts of the 3RS project, and that the construction cost, at an estimate of \$200 billion, was too high.</li> <li>● The Environmental Protection Department should not issue the Environmental Permit for the 3RS project before members of the two Panels had received all deputations' views.</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
5.	Airport Development Concern Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(33)</li> </ul>
6.	Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(34) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
7.	Mr LAM Chiu-ying	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(35) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
8.	ECO Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expressed concern about the conservation of Chinese White Dolphins ("CWDs") and the impact on their habitats arising from the construction works of the 3RS project.</li> <li>● Urged that the 3RS project should be held in abeyance until the proposed marine park was designated and CWDs had been relocated there.</li> </ul>
9.	Ms Sylvia LEE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expressed concern about the noise impact on residents of Park Island in Ma Wan arising from the operation of HKIA.</li> <li>● Given the airspace restrictions ("air wall") around Hong Kong, additional air traffic generated after the commissioning of the proposed 3RS would have to take the path above Park Island, which would aggravate the noise impact on Ma Wan residents.</li> <li>● The mitigation measures proposed in the EIA report had not addressed the concerns of residents of Park Island.</li> <li>● The 3RS project should not proceed before the noise problem was solved.</li> </ul>
10.	Ms CHAN Chiu-lan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Park Island was subject to more serious noise impact from HKIA operation than any other areas in Hong Kong. The problem would deteriorate with the commissioning of the third runway.</li> <li>● Opposed the 3RS project unless the noise problem was solved.</li> </ul>
11.	Ms KWOK Suk-kwan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Suggestions made by Ma Wan residents:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) penalties should be imposed on operators if aircrafts failed to meet the noise restrictions when departing or landing HKIA;</li> <li>(b) the flight paths of aircrafts calling on or leaving HKIA should shun Park Island; and</li> <li>(c) monetary compensation should be provided to residents of Park Island who suffered from the aircraft noise if effective mitigation measures were not implemented.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
12.	Miss Shirley WONG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expressed doubt on the need for 3RS in HKIA and resources required for its implementation should be diverted for tackling more pressing livelihood issues.</li> </ul>

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The EIA process was not equitable, and the EIA report, commissioned by AAHK, the project proponent, had little credibility.</li> <li>● The consultation period for the EIA report was too short and any lay person would find the EIA report too technical and difficult to follow and comment.</li> <li>● Expressed concern about the conservation of CWDs and the impact of the 3RS project construction works on CWDs' habitats.</li> </ul>
13.	Miss YU Hin-pik	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Opposed the implementation of the 3RS project.</li> <li>● The public was not informed of the implications of the Mainland's airspace control on HKIA's runway capacity.</li> <li>● The saturation of the two-runway system by 2016-2017 was not true and misleading.</li> <li>● Mitigation measures were just blank cheques.</li> <li>● Expressed concern about the conservation of CWDs.</li> </ul>
<b><u>Session Two</u></b>		
14.	International Chinese Tourist Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expressed support for the 3RS project in HKIA.</li> <li>● The construction of the third runway would benefit other key sectors in Hong Kong including the travel industry.</li> <li>● Need to maintain the competitive edge of HKIA among neighbouring airports.</li> </ul>
15.	The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(36) (English version only)</li> </ul>
16.	Hong Kong Professional Tourist Guides General Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Expressed support for the 3RS project.</li> <li>● Keen to maintain Hong Kong's status as an important regional and international aviation hub and premier tourist destination.</li> <li>● Hong Kong should enhance its competitiveness and develop its economy.</li> </ul>
17.	Save Lantau Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LC Paper No. CB(4)163/14-15(04) (Chinese version only)</li> </ul>
18.	Hong Kong Airlines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(37)</li> </ul>

**Submissions from parties not attending the meeting**

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission
1.	Momentum 107	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(03) (Chinese version only)
2.	DFS Group	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(05) (English version only) (restricted to Members only)
3.	Ms CHAU Chuen-heung, Islands District Council Member	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(07) (Chinese version only)
4.	Pollution and Protection Services Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(10) (Chinese version only)
5.	Federation of Hong Kong Industries Group 18	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(11) (Chinese version only)
6.	Mr Simon LEE Siu-po	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(16) (Chinese version only)
7.	Asian Institute of Supply Chains and Logistics, CUHK	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(17) (English version only)
8.	Park Island Owners' Committee	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(18) (Chinese version only)
9.	Mr KOO Tak-tsai	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(20) (Chinese version only)
10.	Travelex Currency Exchange Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(22) (English version only)
11.	LSG Lufthansa Service Asia Ltd	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(24) (English version only)
12.	Hong Kong Association of Freight Forwarding and Logistics Ltd.	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(26) (English version only)
13.	China Aircraft Services Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(28) (English version only)
14.	珠江客運有限公司	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(29) (Chinese version only)
15.	Mr Samuel TSE	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(30) (Chinese version only)
16.	Sinopec (Hong Kong) Petrol Filling Station Company Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(31)

17.	Cathay Pacific Services Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(32) (English version only)
18.	Trans-Island Limousine Service Ltd.	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(33) (English version only)
19.	Raffles Medical Group Hong Kong	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(34) (English version only)
20.	DHL Aviation (Hong Kong) Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(35) (English version only)
21.	Hong Kong Aircraft Engineering Company	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(36) (English version only)
22.	ECO Aviation Fuel Services Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(37)
23.	The Chinese Manufacturers' Association of Hong Kong	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(38) (Chinese version only)
24.	Carrier Liaison Group	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(40) (English version only)
25.	Construction Industry Council	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(41) (English version only)
26.	Hong Kong Ideas Centre	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(42) (Chinese version only)
27.	Mr MAK Wing-wah	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(43) (Chinese version only)
28.	Mr WONG Wai-ying	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(44) (Chinese version only)
29.	Federation of Hong Kong Industries	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(45) (Chinese version only)
30.	Mr AU YEUNG Kwok-wah	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(46) (Chinese version only)
31.	The American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(48) (English version only)
32.	Tuen Mun Respect for the Aged Association	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1798/13-14(49) (Chinese version only)
33.	Hong Kong Professionals and Senior Executives Association	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(02) (Chinese version only)

34.	Hong Kong Airline Pilots Association	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(06) (English version only)
35.	Mr Jacky LIM	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(07) (Chinese version only)
36.	Hong Kong Construction Industry Employees General Union	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(08) (Chinese version only)
37.	Hong Kong Economic and Trade Association	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(11) (Chinese version only)
38.	The Chinese General Chamber of Commerce	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(12) (Chinese version only)
39.	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(14) (English version only)
40.	Chairmen and Vice Chairmen of 18 District Councils in Hong Kong	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(17) (Chinese version only)
41.	Mr Chapman CHEN	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(18) (Chinese version only)
42.	SD Advocates	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(19) (Chinese version only)
43.	Hong Kong Ideas Centre	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(20) (Chinese version only)
44.	A member of the public	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(22)
45.	Fifteen members of the public	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(23) (Chinese version only)
46.	Serco Group (HK) Ltd.	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(24) (English version only)
47.	Federation of All Sectors of Tsuen Wan Community Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(25) (Chinese version only)
48.	Nixon Cleaning Co., Ltd.	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(26) (English version only)
49.	Hong Kong Retail Management Association	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(27) (English version only)
50.	Mr Victor LEUNG	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(28) (Chinese version only)
51.	Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(29) (English version only)

52.	Mr YIP Kam-hung	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(30) (Chinese version only)
53.	Mr Francis HO Shiu-hay	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(31) (Chinese version only)
54.	Mr WAN Yuk-shu	● LC Paper No. CB(1)1995/13-14(32) (Chinese version only)
55.	Hong Kong Project Management Exchange Centre	● LC Paper No. CB(4)1073/13-14(03) (Chinese version only)
56.	The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers	● LC Paper No. CB(4)1073/13-14(04) (English version only)
57.	Park Island Owners' Committee	● LC Paper No. CB(4)1073/13-14(07)
58.	Civic Exchange	● LC Paper No. CB(4)1073/13-14(08) (English version only)
59.	Lantau Development Alliance	● LC Paper No. CB(4)163/14-15(03) (English version only)

Council Business Division 4  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
9 January 2015