

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC148/14-15

Ref : FC/1/1(1)

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

Minutes of the 10th meeting
held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Friday, 14 November 2014, at 3:16 pm

Members present:

Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yea, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung

Hon Claudia MO
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent:

Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon WONG Yuk-man
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP

Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP
Hon Dennis KWOK
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan

Public officers attending:

Professor K C CHAN, GBS, JP	Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury
Ms Elizabeth TSE Man-ye, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Ms Esther LEUNG, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)1
Mr Alfred ZHI Jian-hong	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)
Mr WONG Kam-sing, JP	Secretary for the Environment
Mr Howard CHAN Wai-kee, JP	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)
Dr Ellen CHAN Ying-lung, JP	Environmental Protection Department Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure)
Mr Lawrence LAU Ming-ching	Environmental Protection Department Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Landfills and Development)
Mr Elvis AU Wai-kwong, JP	Environmental Protection Department Assistant Director (Nature Conservation and Infrastructure Planning)
	Environmental Protection Department

Clerk in attendance:

Mr Andy LAU	Assistant Secretary General 1
-------------	-------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Mr Derek LO	Chief Council Secretary (1)5
Mr Daniel SIN	Senior Council Secretary (1)7
Mr Ken WOO	Senior Council Secretary (1)5
Mr Raymond SZETO	Council Secretary (1)5
Mr Frankie WOO	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

Item No. 1 – FCR(2014-15)31A
HEAD 705 – CIVIL ENGINEERING
Environmental Protection – Refuse Disposal
164DR – Southeast New Territories Landfill Extension

Item No. 2 – FCR(2014-15)32A
HEAD 705 – CIVIL ENGINEERING
Environmental Protection – Refuse Disposal
163DR – Northeast New Territories Landfill Extension

Item No. 3 – FCR(2014-15)33A
HEAD 705 – CIVIL ENGINEERING
Environmental Protection – Refuse disposal
165DR – West New Territories Landfill Extension

Item No. 4 – FCR(2014-15)34A
HEAD 705 – CIVIL ENGINEERING
Environmental Protection – Refuse Disposal
177DR – Development of integrated waste management facilities phase 1

The Committee continued the joint deliberation on the items FCR(2014-15)31A to 34A.

2. The Chairman said that three members had separately moved four motions to adjourn discussion on the four agenda items under deliberation. All the motions had been negated. It would not be in order for members to move another motion to adjourn discussion on any of these agenda items. He said that the Committee had already spent four and a half hours discussing the four agenda items and another three hours handling six related motions to adjourn discussion of the items or to adjourn further proceedings of the Committee.

3. The Chairman reminded members that five proposed motions to be moved under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee ("FC") Procedure had been received from Mr Gary FAN. The Chairman said that any such motions would be processed following the completion of discussion on the items. He reminded members that proposed motions to be moved under paragraph 37A of the FC Procedure must be directly related to one of the four items under deliberation, and he would first put the proposed motions that he had ruled to be directly related to FCR(2014-15)31A to the Committee to decide whether they should be proceeded forthwith. After the Committee had dealt with these motions, he would put the item FCR(2014-15)31A to vote. He would deal with the remaining three items following the same procedure.

General implementation strategy of landfill extension and the Integrated Waste Management Facilities phase 1

4. Mr Alan LEONG asked if the Administration would consider reducing the scale of, and further phasing out, the extension of the three landfills while stepping up efforts on waste reduction, recovery and recycling. He suggested that the Administration should first proceed with a smaller scale landfill extension and seek funding for further landfill extension and implementation of the Integrated Waste Management Facilities ("IWMF") phase 1 in the light of the progress and effectiveness of waste management measures to be reviewed in a year's time.

5. Secretary for the Environment ("SEN") advised that the proposed scales of extension of the Southeast New Territories ("SENT") and Northeast New Territories ("NENT") landfills were small and their expected operation periods were short. It was not feasible to phase out the extension works any further. However, as the scale of extension of the West New Territories ("WENT") landfill was larger and there might be room for reviewing its implementation schedule along the direction as members suggested.

Waste recovery and recycling issues

6. Ms Cyd HO noted that the Administration had over-estimated the plastics recovery rate because it had mistakenly taken into account the waste plastic materials re-exported through Hong Kong. Ms HO urged the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") to co-ordinate with the Customs and Excise Department ("C&ED") to formulate a clear definition of waste plastic materials so that local plastics recovery could be accurately reported.

7. Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2) ("DDEP(2)") said that C&ED had provided guidelines to re-exporters and explained to them the

proper way to complete customs declaration forms for plastic materials. C&ED staff had also taken the initiatives to seek clarifications from exporters on dubious declaration forms. Recyclers had also been advised not to report re-exported plastic waste as locally generated recycled material.

8. Ms Claudia MO commented that the Administration was not able to convince the public that it would be effective in reducing waste and meet the targets in material recycling. Ms MO mentioned that some green groups had tried to collect plastic bottles from the refuse collection point off the Central Post Office. However, they were told to return the materials to the contract waste collectors who were believed to deliver them to landfills for disposal. Ms MO asked the Administration to clarify if the claim was true. Assistant Director (Environmental Infrastructure) ("AD(EI)") said that the relevant waste collectors had discussed with the green groups concerned and assured them that the plastic material collected would be recovered for recycling rather than for disposal in landfills.

9. Ms Cyd HO queried how the Administration could maintain accurate statistics on plastic recovery rates if there was no separate classification of recovered plastic material in the data gathering process. She suggested that EPD should review the customs declaration system in conjunction with C&ED and the Census and Statistics Department.

10. DDEP(2) explained that calculation of the local plastic recovery rate only took into account locally generated waste plastic material, which would be evident from the information on the origin of material as specified in the declaration form. AD(EI) supplemented that EPD had followed up the matter with C&ED and found that some of the imported plastic materials underwent basic processing and were then re-exported. These materials were often reported as export of locally generated recycled plastic materials. The Administration had advised recyclers on the proper way to enter correct information on the declaration forms. Deliberate reporting of false information was liable to penalty under existing legislation.

11. In response to Ms Cyd HO's further enquiry, AD(EI) explained that there were six classes of plastic materials under the current classification system.

Construction waste disposal charges

12. Mr Gary FAN commented that, by comparison with major cities such as Tokyo, Ontario and Brisbane, the amount of construction waste that required disposal in Hong Kong was disproportionately high, Mr FAN queried whether

the high disposal volume of construction waste was due to the low rate of construction waste disposal charges.

13. SEN responded that direct comparison of construction waste generated in various cities and Hong Kong was not objective because the stages of development of these cities were not the same.

14. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan asked the Administration for a comparison of the landfill charges for construction waste and the disposal cost. He queried whether the Administration was subsidizing developers and construction companies by suppressing the landfill charges on construction waste and whether the Administration would recover the cost of disposal of construction waste and thereby encouraged further waste reduction efforts to be initiated.

15. SEN said that most of the construction waste disposed of at landfills was generated from public works projects, and about 95% of the total construction waste was recovered as fill material. Further increase in disposal charges for construction waste would unlikely result in any significant reduction of construction waste. SEN added that as highlighted in the "Hong Kong: Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources 2013-2022" ("Action Blueprint"), the Administration would explore other means to reduce construction waste.

16. Mr Gary FAN asked about the timetable by which the Administration would conduct the review on construction waste charging. SEN advised that the Administration had started a comprehensive review on waste disposal charging and had initiated discussion with the relevant sectors on the charging levels. The Administration expected that the review could be completed in 2015.

17. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that some local academics had published a research paper in January 2013 which asserted that the effect of the current construction waste charging scheme was only marginal as a waste reduction measure, and it recommended that the Administration should increase the level of charges.

18. The Chairman said that members' questions on the subject had been repetitive.

19. SEN said that the construction sectors' feedback showed that construction waste had significantly been reduced within the first two years after the implementation of the construction waste disposal charging scheme. He reiterated that the Administration had started the process of reviewing the

levels of charges, and recommendations would be submitted to the relevant Panel for consideration in 2015.

20. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan queried why the Administration was reluctant to raise the disposal charge of construction waste from \$125 to \$191 per tonne to recover the cost. He said that adjusting the charge upward would create a strong incentive for developers and contractors to reduce construction waste.

21. SEN reiterated that the construction waste recovery rate had reached 95%. While the Administration considered that there were rooms for increasing disposal charge for construction waste by virtue of the "polluter pays" principle, the extent of further reduction in construction waste might not be significant.

Southeast New Territories landfill extension

Consultation

22. Mr Frederick FUNG noted that the Administration consulted the Sai Kung District Council ("SKDC") on 3 May 2011 on the SENT landfill extension proposal to which SKDC members did not object. He asked whether SKDC had taken a vote on the proposal and, if so, what the voting results were.

23. AD(EI) explained that SKDC had not taken a vote on the proposal, but the SKDC chairman summarized members' discussion and wrapped up the District Council's position from the discussion held. In response to Mr FUNG's follow-up query on the dissenting views raised at SKDC meetings, AD(EI) said that some SKDC members had commented that the SENT landfill was too close to residential developments, and some expressed concerns about the odour problem. The Administration had advised SKDC that after the funding for the SENT landfill extension was approved, odorous municipal solid wastes ("MSW") would be diverted from the SENT landfill to other disposal facilities.

Modes of waste delivery to the SENT landfill

24. Ms Emily LAU urged the Administration to consider suggestions of residents near the SENT landfill on setting up more refuse transfer stations ("RTS"), diverting more of the fill material to public fill by sea, and requiring the trucks to cover the waste which they transport to the SENT landfill.

25. AD(EI) said that the Administration had required trucks carrying construction waste to the SENT landfill through Wan Po Road from sites of the public works projects which cost over \$20 million to install cover to reduce dust. Enforcement efforts would be stepped up against vehicles that caused environmental problems. The Administration was exploring suitable sites in the urban area for provision of additional RTSs. Meanwhile, a barging point in Kai Tak was available starting from September 2014 to carry waste to the SENT landfill by sea. As a result, the number of daily trips of refuse collection vehicles along Wan Po Road had been reduced substantially.

26. Noting that between January and September 2014, only 29 joint enforcement actions were carried out against pollutions by waste haulers, Ms Emily LAU considered that such level of enforcement activity was not sufficient and that the Administration should step up efforts in the regulation of vehicles carrying construction waste.

Exhaustion and closure dates of the SENT landfill

27. Mr Frederick FUNG commented that as the Administration had consistently under-estimated the operable period of the SENT landfill, he was not convinced that the SENT landfill would be exhausted by 2015 as the Administration had claimed. According to his estimation, the SENT landfill should be exhausted in 2016 rather than 2015.

28. AD(EI) said that several factors had to be taken into account in estimating the remaining life of a landfill. These included the growth in population, economy, the rate of waste generation, and the effectiveness of various waste reduction measures. The remaining available space in the SENT landfill and the ability to compress the waste material disposed of would also affect the life of the landfill. AD(EI) added that apart from construction waste, a large amount of MSW was disposed of at the SENT landfill each year. If this remained unchanged, the SENT landfill would likely be exhausted by 2015.

29. AD(EI) explained that allowing for a small growth in the amount of waste requiring disposal in the coming years, the SENT landfill would likely be exhausted in 2015.

30. Mr Frederick FUNG expressed doubt about the Administration's forecast. Mr FUNG pointed out that, if funding was approved, the proposed SENT landfill extension works would be completed in 2017. If the landfill would be exhausted in 2015 as the Administration had claimed, Mr FUNG queried whether the SENT landfill would receive any waste for disposal between 2015 and 2017.

31. AD(EI) said that if the funding for the SENT landfill extension was approved, MSW would be diverted away from the SENT landfill and the operating life of the landfill could be slightly extended.

32. Mr James TIEN asked if the Administration had a timetable to close the SENT landfill. Ms Cyd HO raised a similar query. Ms HO asked whether, if FC approved the SENT landfill extension project, the Administration could use up the extended capacity at the earliest opportunity and close the landfill permanently. DDEP(2) said that the estimated operating life of the proposed SENT landfill extension was about six years, but the actual period might vary according to future development such as the effectiveness of the waste reduction measures. SEN advised that the Administration would conduct a study on long term waste management infrastructure requirement which aimed to minimize the need for landfills.

33. Mr Frederick FUNG noted that if FC approved the funding proposal for SENT landfill extension, odourous MSW would be diverted from the SENT landfill, and, as a result, the operable life could last up to 2017, as against 2015 as the Administration claimed. SEN explained that, subject to FC's approval of the funding proposal, the Administration would implement the proposed restriction of MSW in the SENT landfill. As less waste would be disposed of in the SENT landfill, its operational life would be lengthened. Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Landfills and Development) supplemented that construction waste was denser and could settle more quickly than most MSW so that construction waste would occupy less landfill space than MSW with an equal weight. If the SENT landfill would only accept construction waste, the operational life of the landfill could be extended appreciably.

34. Mr James TIEN queried the Administration's justifications in setting a waste reduction target of 40% while it expected housing construction would increase by 60%.

35. SEN clarified that the target of reduction of 40% was set for MSW which did not include construction waste and would be achievable with the implementation of the various waste reduction measures outlined in the Action Blueprint. SEN added that the Administration would consider measures to reduce construction waste from public works projects. The construction waste disposal charging scheme would be reviewed to consider whether stronger incentive would be provided to encourage further reduction in construction waste in the private sector. SEN said that the construction sector had also produced a document that outlined possible construction methods that helped reduce the production of construction waste.

West New Territories landfill extension and Northeast New Territories landfill extension

36. Dr KWOK Ka-ki criticized that the Administration did not have a clear timetable to achieve the waste reduction targets as set out in the Action Blueprint. Dr KWOK also criticized the Administration for not willing to meet local Tuen Mun residents on matters related to the proposed extension of the WENT landfill. He questioned the Administration's sincerity on waste reduction.

37. SEN responded that the Action Blueprint had set out a clear timetable in achieving waste reduction targets. He added that the Administration had held more than 340 meetings with community groups and respective District Councils on issues related to the three landfill extension proposals as well as the proposed IWFM phase 1. DDEP(2) supplemented that more than 80 meetings had been held with community groups, stakeholders and residents of Tuen Mun who were directly affected by the proposed landfill extension proposal.

38. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that he had invited officials many times since 23 August 2013 to meet with local residents in Tuen Mun to discuss matters related to the WENT landfill extension proposal, but to no avail. He criticized the Administration for showing no sincerity in addressing residents' concerns. The Chairman asked the Administration to provide information on the meetings that the Administration had conducted with local residents and/or the local resident groups affected by the proposed WENT landfill extension since 23 August 2013.

39. Dr KWOK Ka-ki asked if SEN would meet with residents of Ta Kwu Ling affected by the proposed NENT Landfill extension in the coming two weeks, as the residents wished to express their objection directly to the Administration. SEN said that the Administration would consider requests from the public on a case-by-case basis. Dr KWOK criticized the Administration for not willing to listen to the views of the community.

40. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung queried which resident groups or which residents the Administration had met to discuss the landfill extension proposals. Mr LEUNG commented that if the Administration claimed to have met with all the relevant stakeholders affected by the landfill extension projects and SEN was reluctant to meet with Ta Kwu Ling residents, the Administration did not consider those residents were project stakeholders.

41. Mr Alan LEONG said that the Administration should progressively implement the measures outlined in the Action Blueprint and, depending on the

progress and effectiveness of the measures, consider extending existing landfills in smaller scale. In this connection, he queried whether the scale of the WENT landfill and the NENT landfill extension proposals would be reduced.

42. The Chairman said that the question had been repeated.

43. SEN said that in many overseas jurisdictions, local authorities would maintain landfill capacity sufficient for decades of operation. The current scale of landfill extension proposals was small by comparison. SEN reiterated that while there was room for phased implementation of the WENT landfill extension, it was not meaningful for further reduction of the SENT and NENT landfill extension.

Integrated Waste Management Facilities

Site selection

44. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung noted that there were examples that waste incinerators were located in close proximity of residential developments. He asked if IWMFs could be located in urban areas. SEN advised that it would be difficult to identify a site in the urban area that was large enough, and with suitable ancillary supporting infrastructure, to accommodate an IWMF.

Emission standards of IWMF phase 1

45. Dr Helena WONG asked if amendments to the Air Pollution Control Ordinance (Cap. 311) ("APCO") were needed to regulate the emission of the proposed IWMF phase 1 and how the Administration would allay the community's concern that toxic substances generated in IWMF would be effectively filtered to minimize damage to public health. Assistant Director (Nature Conservation and Infrastructure Planning) ("AD(NC&IP)") said that the emission levels of IWMF phase 1 would comply with the stringent standards as formulated by the European Union ("EU") and should meet the requirements of the latest Air Quality Objectives ("AQO") under APCO. Amendments to APCO were not necessary.

46. Dr Helena WONG asked whether the emissions and harmful substances might be carried by wind to residential areas in Cheung Chau and Lantau Island. AD(NC&IP) added that IWMF phase 1 was quite far away from Cheung Chau. The design of IWMF phase 1 had incorporated designs and purification systems that conformed to EU standards. The levels of dioxins and other toxic substances generated were far below the limits as set out in EU standards. SEN further advised that the prevailing wind direction was

immaterial to the impact on air quality of nearby areas as the emissions that left the chimneys of IWWMF phase 1 were already within the limits under the EU standards.

47. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that in the public consultation document on "Hong Kong's Climate Change Strategy and Action Agenda", the Government had set out target for reducing carbon intensity that the operation of IWWMF phase 1 would produce a large amount of carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide. Mr CHAN asked if the operation of IWWMF phase 1 would be counterproductive to achieving the carbon intensity reduction target. SEN advised that the emission of carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide from IWWMF phase 1 and the carbon intensity reduction target were totally unrelated.

48. Dr Helena WONG asked if the Administration was aware of the development and the locations of the three waste incinerators which the Shenzhen authorities planned to build and if the emissions from these facilities and IWWMF phase 1 would adversely affect Hong Kong. SEN responded that the installation of waste treatment facilities in the Mainland was not related to the current deliberation. He added that emissions from modern waste incineration facilities were small compared with power plants, vehicles or vessels.

49. Dr Helena WONG asked if APCO prescribed requirements on the levels of dioxins and other harmful substances from the emissions of IWWMF phases 1, and whether there were penalties for breach of the requirements. AD(NC&IP) said that according to the EIA report of IWWMF phase 1, dioxins levels in the chimneys should meet the standards prescribed by EU and the ambient dioxins concentration should also meet AQOs under APCO. Waste incineration was a specified process which required a licence under APCO. AD(NC&IP) said that the licence for IWWMF phase 1 had prescribed the permitted dioxins level, and breach of licence conditions was liable to a penalty.

Disposal of ash produced by IWWMF phase 1

50. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked why the ash produced arising from the operation of IWWMF phase 1 would be disposed of in the WENT landfill, and whether the proposed extension part of the WENT landfill would be used for the disposal of the ash. Mr WU Chi-wai raised a similar query.

51. SEN said that the Administration was exploring whether the ash produced by IWWMF could be used as construction material. AD(NC&IP) supplemented that coal ash, which contained trace of toxic substances such as heavy metals, would be stabilized with cement and disposed of in landfills after

they were tested to have met specified safety standards. AD(NC&IP) added that furnace bottom ash did not contain toxic substances and could be used as construction material. The Administration had funded research institutions to develop technologies on the application of furnace bottom ash.

Health impact of IWMF phase 1

52. Mr James TO asked whether the Administration had assessed the health impact of the emission from IWMF phase 1 on inmates and staff of the Shek Kwu Chau Treatment and Rehabilitation Centre, as well as the residents in the vicinity.

53. AD(NC&IP) replied that the relevant health risk assessment of IWMF phase 1 had been included in the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") report, which concluded that the operation of IWMF phase 1 had no adverse health impact on the nearby residents. The operation of IWMF phase 1 complied with the standards of the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") of the United States ("US") and the EIA findings had been confirmed by the Department of Health to be acceptable. AD(NC&IP) said that the US EPA health standards were among the more stringent requirements among different countries and had been widely adopted. Modern waste incineration facilities in Europe and Japan were located more closely to residential areas than was the proposed IWMF phase 1.

54. Mr James TO asked the Administration to provide information on the standards adopted in the US, EU countries and Japan in assessing the health impact arising from the operation of waste incineration facilities as compared to those adopted in Hong Kong in respect of the proposed IWMF phase 1.

Consultation and liaison with local residents

55. Dr KWOK Ka-ki asked why the Administration sought funding approval for the proposed IWMF phase 1 project when many Cheung Chau residents did not support it and the judicial review against it had not yet been concluded.

56. AD(NC&IP) explained that the IWMF phase 1 project was already behind schedule. The tendering process would take two years to complete. It was considered necessary to conduct the tendering exercise in parallel with the judicial process, so that the Administration could make up the lost time and award the construction contract once the Court had concluded that the IWMF phase 1 project could proceed.

Export of surplus electricity from IWWMF phase 1

57. Dr Helena WONG asked to which power company's grid would the surplus electricity from IWWMF phase 1 be exported and whether the Government or the power companies would be responsible for the connection and related costs.

58. AD(NC&IP) advised that the Administration was liaising with the CLP Power Hong Kong for exporting the surplus electricity from IWWMF phase 1 to its grids. The Administration would be responsible for the cost of connection, construction of substations and associated facilities and the installation of power export systems. These costs had been included in the project estimates of IWWMF phase 1, and the details on the sales of electricity would be negotiated separately after the funding proposal for IWWMF phase 1 was approved.

Separation of wastes before being delivered to IWWMF phase 1

59. Citing overseas incidents of explosion due to mixing of household waste with batteries in a waste incinerator, Ms Cyd HO said that the Administration should promote household waste separation. Mr WU Chi-wai asked if the Administration would introduce further waste separation process to remove non-combustible material from the waste delivered for treatment at IWWMF phase 1.

60. AD(NC&IP) said that source-separated household waste would first be delivered to RTS where unsuitable materials were be removed from the waste before it was delivered to IWWMF phase 1 for incineration. There were also additional safeguards in IWWMF phase 1 to remove dangerous substances before the bulk of waste materials were treated. SEN acknowledged that mixing non-combustible material (such as glass) in the waste for treatment at IWWMF phase 1 would reduce the facilities' efficiency. The Administration was exploring measures such as producer responsibility scheme to improve recovery of these materials and reduce non-combustible materials from being delivered for treatment at IWWMF phase 1.

Motion to adjourn further proceedings of the Committee

61. Mr Gary FAN moved, without notice, a motion pursuant to paragraph 39 of the FC Procedure that further proceedings of the Committee be then adjourned.

62. As the meeting was near the scheduled closing time, the Chairman declared that the meeting be adjourned and directed that Mr FAN's motion be dealt with at the second meeting scheduled for the day after a break of ten minutes.

63. The meeting was adjourned at 5:14 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat

29 April 2015