

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)651/14-15
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Minutes of special meeting
held on Tuesday, 6 January 2015, at 9:00 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP (Chairman)
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Dennis KWOK
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, 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 attending : Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon YIU Si-wing

Members absent: Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG

**Public Officers
attending : For item I**

Mr TSE Chin-wan, JP
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Environmental Protection Department

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

Mr Louis CHAN
Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Regional Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Joseph SHAM
Assistant Director (Country and Marine Parks)
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Dr Ivan CHAN
Acting Senior Fisheries Officer (Fisheries Management)
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

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

**Attendance by
Invitation : Session One**

Green Sense

Mr Roy TAM
Chief Executive Officer

Friends of the Earth (HK)

Miss CHAU Yuet-cheung
Assistant Environmental Affairs Manager

New People's Party

Mr KAM Man-fung
Central Committee Member

Individual

Mr Dominic YIN

Hong Kong Economic & Trade Association

Mr YEUNG Chi-tit
Vice President

Hong Kong Professionals And Senior Executives
Association

Ir Professor Philip CHAN Kan-ip
Member

Individual

Mr Simon LEE Siu-po

Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design

Mr TAM Po-yiu
Chairman of Public Affairs Committee

Individual

Ms SO Lai-chun

The Hong Kong Institute of Planners

Mr Kenneth TO
Vice President

The Kowloon Taxi Owners Association Limited

Mr WAN Cheuk-ming
Chairman

Hong Kong Taxi Owners' Association Limited

Mr WONG Po-keung
Chairman

HK Dolphin Conservation Society

Dr Samuel HUNG
Chairman

Asian Institute of Supply Chain and Logistics

Mr CHEUNG Wai-man
Director

Hong Kong Construction Association

Mr Ringo YU
Vice President

Hong Kong Association of China Travel Organisers
Limited

Mr Tommy TAM Kwong-shun
Vice President

Individual

Mr Holden CHOW Ho-ding

Individual

Mr HO Hin-ming

Individual

Ms HO Ka-po

Hong Kong Inbound Tour Operators Association

Mr Ricky TSE
Chairman

Hong Kong Airport Services Limited

Ms Jodi KWOK Chui-man
Head of Human Resources

Air Hong Kong Limited

Captain Russell DAVIE
Chief Operating Officer

Airline Operators Committee

Ms Liza NG
Chairman

Hong Kong Dragon Airlines Limited

Mr Alex LAU
General Manager, International Affairs

Cathay Pacific Catering Services (HK) Limited

Mrs Jenny LAM
Chief Executive Officer

Cathay Pacific Airways Limited

Mr James TONG
Director Corporate Affairs

Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce

Mr Watson CHAN
Senior Director - Policy & China Business

Individual

Mr MAK Chi-kit

Hong Kong Project Management Exchange Centre
Limited

Mr YIM Kin-ping
Chairman

九龍塘大學社會政策學系機場三跑道系統關注組

Mr FU Ka-ho
Member

Hong Kong Small and Medium Enterprises
Association

Mr Danny LAU Tat-pong
Life Honorary Chairman

Session Two

Individual

Miss LAI Tsz-yan

DHL Aviation (Hong Kong) Limited

Mr Tony KHAN
General Manager, Central Asia Hub

Cathay Pacific Services Limited

Mr Alex SHUM
Chief Operating Officer

Innovation and Technology Association

Ir Spencer LI
President

Asia Airfreight Terminal Company Limited

Mr CHUN Kin-ming
General Manager, Support Services

Individual

Mr AU YEUNG Kwok-wah

Individual

Ms LEE Ching-yi

Hong Kong Air Cargo Terminals Limited

Mr Mark WHITEHEAD
Chief Executive

N. T. Taxi Operation Union

Mr CHAN Shu-sang
Chairman

Individual

Mr Thomas LEDGER

Tung Chung Safe and Healthy City

Mr WUN Yuk-shu

Individual

Ms LAU Suk-han

China Aircraft Services Limited

Mr Jack LI Chang-yuan
General Manager, Commercial & Customer Support

Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance

Mr Jude CHOW Chee-ping
Vice Convener, Waste Management Panel

Individual

Ms YEUNG Ching-nga

Individual

Mr LEUNG Chun-hin

Individual

Miss SU Tsz-ki

Individual

Ms YU Hin-pik

Individual

Mr KWOK Ho-man

Individual

Miss KAM Ka-man

The Lion Rock Institute (HK)

Mr Andrew SHUEN Pak-man
Research Director

香港工商總會

Mr CHAN Chuen-chui
Member

荃灣各界協會

陳世光先生
Chairman

荃灣青年會

Mr CHEUNG Ka-wing
Representative

Liberal Party

Mr Mark FU

Liberal Party Youth Committee

Mr Dominic LEE
Chairman

本土機場發展聯盟

Mr Harris YEUNG

機場發展關注組

Mr William TSANG

第三條跑道關注組

Mr Fun CHEUNG

Hong Kong Young Industrialists Council

Mr Eric YIM Chi-ming
President

Session Three

Worldwide Flight Services

Mr Terence BOO
General Manager

Hong Kong Airport Ramp Services Employees Union

Mr LI Wing-foo
Chairman

The Staffs & Workers Union of Hong Kong Civil
Airlines

Mr IP Wai-ming
Vice General Secretary

Hong Kong Air Cargo Terminals Employees Union

Mr Wilson YAP Yee-liek
Vice Chairman

民航東涌地區幹事會

Mr TING Sung-ki
Chairman

Save Lantau Alliance

Mr TSE Sai-kit
Convenor

Civic Party

Mr Peter YU

Eco Association

Miss Jenny C M CHENG
Vice Chief Executive Officer

Individual

Mr LEE Chi-fung

Individual

Mr MAN Wai-cheong

Individual

Mr KUNG Hok-sing

Individual

Mr CHAN Wan-sum

Individual

Mr CHEUNG Kwong-yam

Individual

Ms LI Sau-mui

Individual

Ms LEE Sau-lan

Session Four

Individual

Mr CHENG Chu-hung

Individual

Ms CHUI Shing-fan

San Tau Village

Mr HO Siu-kei
Representative

Individual

Miss TSE Kwai-ying

Individual

Mr TSE King-tin

Individual

Ms TSE Lai-ngo

Individual

Mr TSE Kwok-hong

Individual

Mr TSE Chi-hang

Individual

Mr CHOW Yiu-jo

Individual

Ms TSE Kwai-ying

Hong Kong Institution of Highways and
Transportation

Ir TSE Pak-kin
Council Member

HK Wildlife.net

Mr WONG Chi-chun

Individual

Miss NG Ching-yan

Individual

Mr TAM Cheuk-man

Clean Air Network

Mr LOONG Tsz-wai
Community Relations Manager

Tradeport Hong Kong Limited

Mr Kenneth BAO
Chief Executive Officer

**Clerk in
attendance** : Ms Shirley CHAN
Chief Council Secretary (1)1

**Staff in
attendance** : Miss Lilian MOK
Senior Council Secretary (1)1

Ms Mandy LI
Council Secretary (1)1

Miss Mandy POON
Legislative Assistant (1)1

Action

I. Receiving public views on "Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System and its related impacts on the environment"

Relevant papers

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)401/14-15(04) —Letter dated January 2014 from Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok (Chinese version only)
- LC Paper No. IN02/14-15 —Information note on "Strategic Environmental Assessment" prepared by the Research Office of the Legislative Council Secretariat
- LC Paper No. CB(1)408/14-15(01) —Administration's paper on follow-up to Environmental Impact Assessment for the Three-Runway System Project
- LC Paper No. CB(1)245/14-15(03) —Administration's paper on "Environmental Impact Assessment for the Three-Runway System Project"
- LC Paper No. CB(1)245/14-15(04) —Background brief on "Environmental Impact Assessment for the Three-Runway System Project" prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat
- LC Paper No. CB(4)259/14-15(01) —List of follow-up actions arising from the discussion on issues related to the Three-Runway System project for the Hong Kong International Airport and the relevant Environmental Impact Assessment report

Action

LC Paper No. CB(4)259/14-15(02) —Administration and Airport Authority Hong Kong's paper on follow-up to issues related to the Three-Runway System project for the Hong Kong International Airport and the relevant Environmental Impact Assessment report)

Session One

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of 31 deputations/individuals presented their views on the expansion of the Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA") into a Three-Runway System ("3RS") and its related impacts on the environment. A summary of the views of these deputations/individuals was in the **Annex**.

2. Members also noted the submissions from 21 organizations and 15 members of the public not attending the meeting. Their submissions were listed on the agenda of the meeting.

Response by the Administration

3. In response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals, the Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1) ("DDEP(1)") advised that the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") process was an open and transparent statutory process. It provided a platform for striking an appropriate balance between nature conservation and development. Under the EIA mechanism, the proponent of a designated project was required to prepare an EIA report in accordance with the Study Brief and the Technical Memorandum issued under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (Cap. 499) ("the TM-EIAO"). The TM-EIAO set out the principles, procedures, guidelines, requirements and objective criteria for deciding whether the designated project was environmentally acceptable. In deciding whether the EIA report of the 3RS project should be approved, the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") had carefully considered the comments of the Advisory Council on the Environment ("ACE") and those received during the public inspection period as well as the advice from relevant Government departments and authorities under the TM-EIAO (e.g. the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department ("AFCD")) to advise on ecology and the Civil Aviation

Action

Department ("CAD") on aircraft related issues) in accordance with the statutory procedures and objective requirements under the TM-EIAO.

4. The Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (Country and Marine Parks) ("ADAF(C&MP)") explained that the technical aspects of the EIA process involved various disciplines and AFCD was responsible for matters relating to nature conservation, ecological assessment, fisheries, etc. The 18 proposed mitigation measures and four recommendations put forth by ACE were considered effective in enhancing protection of ecology. The General Manager, Environment (Projects), Airport Authority Hong Kong ("GM, E(P)/AAHK") assured members that after the 3RS project had been granted an Environmental Permit, all the 18 proposed mitigation measures had been taken on board. AAHK would continue to enhance communication with local communities on the 3RS project.

Discussion

5. Mr YIU Si-wing said that according to the forecast of the United Nations World Tourism Organization, global tourism would grow by 4% to 5% every year, reaching 1.8 billion tourists travelling around the world in 2030. As a surge in tourists was expected in the coming years, Hong Kong was facing intensifying competition from neighbouring airports which had been actively engaged in airport expansion plans. 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, there was an urgent need to commence the 3RS project. As the EIA report of the 3RS project had covered various environmental aspects, Mr YIU enquired about the financial provision that AAHK planned to set aside for implementing different mitigation measures to address the environmental concerns.

6. GM, E(P)/AAHK responded that AAHK had accorded high importance to addressing all the potential environmental impacts associated with the 3RS project. In the EIA report of the 3RS project, AAHK had proposed the adoption of green technologies and a series of mitigation measures to alleviate the environmental impacts brought by the project. While the costs of implementing the mitigation measures were not assessed separately, the relevant costs had been included in the overall project estimate. In an effort to protect ecology, AAHK had also proposed to establish the Marine Ecology Enhancement Fund and the Fisheries Enhancement Fund for the conservation of marine life and enhancing fisheries resources. AAHK would submit the setup of these two Funds to ACE for comment before making the submission to the Director of Environmental Protection ("DEP") for approval. Mr YIU Si-wing opined that AAHK should separate the financial provision for the

Action

implementation of mitigation measures from the overall project estimate so that the public would get to know and appreciate AAHK's commitment to protecting the environment.

7. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok sought elaboration on airspace management. GM, E(P)/AAHK responded that CAD was responsible for the control of movement of aircraft within Hong Kong's airspace. According to his understanding, a tripartite working group, namely the Pearl River Delta Region Air Traffic Management Planning and Implementation Supervisory Group, had been set up in 2004 by CAD, the Civil Aviation Administration of China and the Civil Aviation Authority of Macau to rationalize the use of airspace and air traffic management so as to accommodate the rising demand of aviation of the entire Pearl River Delta ("PRD") region. Taking into account the expansion plans of the airports in PRD, the tripartite working group had formulated a comprehensive plan to rationalize airspace design and planning, including the development of flight paths for 3RS in accordance with the international standards and recommendations promulgated by the International Civil Aviation Organization ("ICAO").

8. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok further sought the views of Captain Russell DAVIE, Chief Operating Officer of the Air Hong Kong Limited, on Hong Kong's airspace management. Captain DAVIE advised that the existing arrival and departure flight paths of HKIA had been developed in the 1950s. For the 3RS project, the position and alignment of the third runway and its associated flight path not only met international safety standards but would also enable maximum aircraft movements in Hong Kong's airspace. Given that the 3RS project was a topical issue of public concern, Ir Dr LO urged the Administration and AAHK to maintain open and proactive communication with the public to enhance their understanding of the operation of 3RS and the efforts made by AAHK in environmental protection.

9. Ms Cyd HO also expressed concern about Hong Kong's airspace management. She said that, as pointed out by some deputations, the existing "air wall" restrictions, which were altitude requirements for aircraft departing from Hong Kong to enter the Mainland airspace, might limit the capacity of the existing two runways and even the proposed third runway. She requested the Administration to provide information on the "air wall" between the Hong Kong and Mainland airspace, as well as details of regional co-operation on airspace management among the civil aviation authorities of the Mainland, Hong Kong and Macau.

Admin

10. Referring to the views of Mr Kenneth TO, Vice President of The Hong Kong Institute of Planners, who was concerned that the commissioning of the

Action

third runway would aggravate air and noise pollution problems in Tung Chung, Ms Cyd HO pointed out that although New Zealand's Gross Domestic Product ("GDP") ranked 30th globally, the country's largest city, Auckland had the world's best quality of living. In recent years, there had been increasing concerns about quality of life issues and the adequacy of traditional economic statistics, such as GDP, as measures of people's living conditions. In 2007, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development ("OECD") had conducted a study on economic well-being which argued that the definition of well-being should include not only material living conditions, such as income and wealth, but also the ability to pursue one's goals, to thrive and feel satisfied with their life. Ms HO enquired if the Administration had taken into account the concept of economic well-being when planning to expand HKIA into a 3RS.

11. GM, E(P)/AAHK responded that the use of OECD's economic well-being indicators as measures of the impacts of the 3RS project was beyond the existing statutory requirements. The EIA report of the 3RS project had been prepared in accordance with the EIAO and had met the requirements of the EIA Study Brief and the TM-EIAO. As regards the "air wall" issue, GM, E(P)/AAHK explained that according to a runway capacity analysis for HKIA, the practical maximum capacity that could be achieved by the existing two runways was 68 movements per hour. Hence, the close proximity between HKIA and its Shenzhen counterpart and the so-called "air wall" restrictions (i.e. the designated altitude requirements) had no direct relationship with the space separation between runway movements and did not affect runway capacity.

12. The Deputy Chairman was of the view that development and conservation of the environment were equally important, and striking a balance between them was an essential element for sustainable development. Referring to a media report that a Chinese White Dolphin ("CWD") had been found dead in the Hong Kong waters, the Deputy Chairman expressed grave concern about whether the mitigation measures proposed by ACE were adequate enough to protect marine life, in particular CWDs, within the Hong Kong and the Pearl River Estuary waters.

13. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, Dr Samuel HUNG, Chairman of HK Dolphin Conservation Society, pointed out that a lot of major infrastructure projects (e.g. the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge local projects and the 3RS project) were under construction or planning near Lantau Island and the cumulative impacts of these projects on marine ecology were significant. In recent years, there was a marked decrease in the number of CWDs in Hong Kong. Dr HUNG casted doubt on the effectiveness of the 18 mitigation measures proposed by ACE in protecting marine ecology. He also queried whether the proposed marine park of 2 400 hectares could benefit the well-being

Action

of CWDs during the construction period of the 3RS project as the marine park would be established only after the works of the 3RS project were completed. He criticized that it was too hasty for the Administration to approve the EIA report as many environmental problems still remained unresolved.

Session Two

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

14. At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of 30 deputations/individuals presented their views on the expansion of HKIA into 3RS and its related impacts on the environment. A summary of the views of these deputations/individuals was in the **Annex**.

Response by the Administration

15. In response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals, DDEP(1) stressed that the EIA process was an open and transparent statutory process. It provided a platform for striking an appropriate balance between nature conservation and development. Under the EIA mechanism, the proponent of a designated project was required to prepare an EIA report in accordance with the Study Brief and the TM-EIAO. The TM-EIAO set out the principles, procedures, guidelines, requirements and objective criteria for deciding whether the designated project was environmentally acceptable. In deciding whether the EIA report of the 3RS project should be approved, EPD had carefully considered the comments of ACE and those received during the public inspection period as well as the advice from relevant Government departments and authorities under the TM-EIAO (e.g. AFCD to advise on ecology and the Marine Department ("MD") on marine safety) in accordance with the statutory procedures and objective requirements under the TM-EIAO. To ensure that the 3RS project would be designed, constructed and operated in accordance with the recommendations contained in the EIA report as well as the EP conditions, AAHK would conduct comprehensive environmental monitoring and audit ("EM&A") during both the construction and operation phases of the project. In addition, a full-time on-site Independent Environmental Checker would be engaged to audit the EM&A performance. The Independent Environmental Checker would notify DEP direct if any non-compliance was identified. The results and findings of each audit would also be documented in regular EM&A reports submitted to DEP. Violations of the EP conditions might lead to prosecution. DDEP(1) also briefly explained the similarities and differences between strategic environmental assessment ("SEA") and statutory EIA of individual projects. He clarified that similar to a SEA, the 3RS EIA

Action

also needed to assess the cumulative environmental impacts of other related committed/planned projects in the vicinity .

16. ADAFC(C&MP) advised that in the EIA process, AFCD would advise on matters relating to nature conservation, ecological assessment, fisheries, etc. Noting that there were views that no tagging or marking studies had been conducted to review the conservation status of CWDs, ADAFC(C&MP) clarified that AFCD had been closely monitoring the geographic distribution and abundance of CWDs through photo-identification which involved taking photographs of unique markings on dolphins' back and dorsal fins. The photos would be catalogued for studying the behaviour of individual dolphins as well as understanding their movement patterns. Photo-identification indicated that CWDs moved across the Hong Kong and PRD waters. In the EIA report of the 3RS project, investigation on the movement patterns of CWDs during different times of the years and different times of each day at or near the project area had also been conducted. ADAFC(C&MP) further pointed out that while the number of CWDs had dropped during the construction of HKIA in the 1990s, the number of CWDs had returned to pre-construction level afterwards.

17. GM, E(P)/AAHK further advised that AAHK was reviewing the cost of the 3RS project and would submit a financial arrangement proposal to the Administration for consideration shortly. As suggested by some green groups, AAHK had conducted a preliminary research on Social Return on Investment ("SROI") case studies worldwide. The research findings showed that there was no internationally recognized standards and approaches for conducting SROI studies particularly for mega infrastructure projects. In this connection, AAHK considered SROI not applicable for the 3RS project. Separately, AAHK had conducted a study to assess carbon emission associated with the project, which showed that the economic benefits of the project was far more significant than the environmental costs of carbon emissions.

Discussion

18. Mr Frankie YICK declared that he was a Board Member of AAHK and the Director of the Hong Kong Air Cargo Terminals Limited. While expressing support for the 3RS project, he enquired about the reasons for not conducting any tagging or marking studies to monitor the conservation status of CWDs. In reply, ADAFC(C&MP) advised that CWDs were protected in Hong Kong by the Wild Animals Protection Ordinance (Cap. 170). Any person willfully disturbing or unlawfully capturing protected wild animals would be liable to penalties upon conviction. To obtain accurate information on the status of the CWD population in Hong Kong, biopsy samples of CWDs had been collected several years ago. However, as the number of CWDs had been decreasing,

Action

AFCD considered it more desirable to adopt other approaches which were less invasive. Notwithstanding the Administration's explanation, Mr YICK urged the Administration to proactively conduct dedicated scientific study on CWDs in order to collect more systematic and in-depth information to ascertain the distribution and abundance of this species in Hong Kong.

19. The Chairman asked if the Administration would consider enhancing cross-boundary collaboration in conducting regular ecological surveys on CWDs in the Hong Kong and PRD waters. ADAFC(C&MP) responded that the Administration had been conducting regular ecological surveys and updating the status of different marine species since early 2000. It also conserved and monitored the population of CWDs through the existing Conservation Programme for CWDs which had been implemented since 2001. As different large-scale cross-boundary projects were in the pipeline, AFCD would closely communicate with relevant Mainland authorities to enhance co-operation and exchanges on conservation and research work on CWDs. The Chairman urged the Administration to proactively explore co-operation opportunities with neighbouring Mainland cities on the protection of marine ecology in order to address the concerns of the public over the conservation of CWDs.

20. Mr James TIEN enquired whether the EIA report of the 3RS project had recommended any mitigation measure to minimize the impact of aircraft noise on the districts near the flight path. DDEP(1) explained that the noise impact arising from aircraft operation was represented by an internationally adopted metric called Noise Exposure Forecast ("NEF") contours. NEF contours were produced taking into account factors such as the duration of flyover, the peak noise level, the tonal characteristics and the number of aircraft movements in both the daytime and night-time period. Residential uses should not be planned inside the NEF 25 contour criteria stipulated in the TM-EIAO. The 3RS EIA report indicated that Tuen Mun, Tsing Yi, Gold Coast and Tsuen Wan were all outside NEF 25 and hence meeting the statutory requirement.

21. GM, E(P)/AAHK supplemented that AAHK had set up five Community Liaison Groups covering Islands District, Kwai Tsing, Shatin, Tsuen Wan and Tuen Mun to exchange views with District Councillors and other community leaders on airport development and a range of environmental subjects such as aircraft noise and air quality. In an effort to deepen community outreach, members of the public from residential districts along the flight path had been invited to a briefing on the environmental aspects of the 3RS project and experience the aircraft noise levels on-site by the departure runway. With the advancement of aviation technology, aircraft engines were quieter than before, and the improvement in the design of airframe had also helped reduce noise significantly.

Action

22. Mr Vincent FANG expressed concern about the handling capacity of HKIA before the planned commissioning of 3RS in 2023. GM, E(P)/AAHK advised that the practical maximum runway capacity of the existing two-runway system ("2RS") of HKIA was 420 000 aircraft movements annually and it was estimated that the airport would reach its maximum capacity sometime between 2016 and 2017. If AAHK was able to commence the construction works as early as possible in 2016, the initial phase of the 3RS project was expected to be completed by 2023. With 3RS in place, the capacity of HKIA would increase substantially from 420 000 flight movements per year under 2RS to 620 000 per year.

23. GM, E(P)/AAHK further said that in light of the imminent saturation of 2RS before the planned commissioning of 3RS in 2023, AAHK was actively working on enhancing HKIA's runway capacity through improvements in airport operation. Any measure to be introduced would comply with the international safety standards promulgated by ICAO. Since a detailed expansion plan for HKIA was crucial in maintaining Hong Kong's competitiveness as a strategic aviation hub and would facilitate airlines to make their business plans, AAHK produced a 20-year master plan for the development of HKIA every five years to study different strategic aspects of airport planning.

24. The Deputy Chairman referred to the written submission from Mr LAM Chiu-ying (LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(31)), which criticized the Administration for under-estimating the ecological impacts of reclamation on CWDs. DDEP(1) responded that although the construction of the 3RS project might lead to a loss of travelling and habitat areas for CWDs, the proposed establishment of a new marine park of 2 400 hectares would promote the recovery of fisheries resources and provide a habitat for CWDs. The proposed marine park would also connect the existing Sha Chau and Lung Kwu Chau Marine Park to its north and the committed marine park at the Brothers to the east, forming a huge continuous stretch of marine protected area. ADAFC(C&MP) supplemented that the total size of the above mentioned marine parks together with the Hong Kong International Airport Approach Area, i.e. the airport exclusion zone would form a marine protected area of over 5 200 hectares. It was expected that the synergy effect thus gained would contribute significantly to the long-term conservation of CWDs. Notwithstanding the explanation, the Deputy Chairman doubted the Administration's determination to establish the said marine parks for the protection of marine ecology and opined that the Administration should establish the marine parks before implementing the 3RS project in order to compensate the loss of habitat areas for CWDs.

Session Three

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

25. The Deputy Chairman chaired the meeting in the absence of the Chairman. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, a total of 15 deputations/individuals presented their views on the expansion of HKIA into 3RS and its related impacts on the environment. A summary of the views of these deputations/individuals was in the **Annex**.

Response by the Administration

26. In response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals, DDEP(1) briefly introduced the EIA process and the EP system. He stressed that the EIA process was an open and transparent statutory process. It provided a platform for striking an appropriate balance between nature conservation and development. Under the EIA mechanism, the proponent of a designated project was required to prepare an EIA report in accordance with the Study Brief and the TM-EIAO. The TM-EIAO set out the principles, procedures, guidelines, requirements and objective criteria for deciding whether the designated project was environmentally acceptable. In deciding whether the EIA report of the 3RS project should be approved, EPD had carefully considered the comments of ACE and those received during the public inspection period as well as the advice from relevant Government departments and authorities under the TM-EIAO (e.g. AFCD to advise on ecology, MD on marine safety and CAD on aircraft related issues) in accordance with the statutory procedures and objective requirements under the TM-EIAO.

27. As regards the concerns about aircraft noise at Sha Lo Wan, DDEP(1) advised that according to the EIA report, when 3RS came into operation, the existing South Runway could be put on standby mode at night. The aircraft noise impact on North Lantau, in particular Sha Lo Wan Village, would be alleviated. To ensure that the 3RS project would be designed, constructed and operated in accordance with the recommendations contained in the EIA report as well as the EP conditions, AAHK would conduct comprehensive EM&A during both the construction and operation phases of the project. In addition, a full-time on-site Independent Environmental Checker would be engaged to audit the EM&A performance. The Independent Environmental Checker would notify DEP direct if any non-compliance was identified. The results and findings of each audit would also be documented in regular EM&A reports submitted to DEP. Violations of the EP conditions might lead to prosecution. In case the EP holder needed to make changes to his project design which would affect its environmental performance, an application for variation of the EP

Action

would be required together with an assessment to demonstrate the environmental acceptability for the variations sought.

28. ADAFC(C&MP) advised that in the EIA process, AFCD would advise on matters relating to nature conservation, ecological assessment, fisheries, etc. The 18 proposed mitigation measures and four recommendations put forth by ACE were considered effective in enhancing protection of ecology. The designation of a new marine park of about 2 400 hectares to provide a habitat for CWDs was one of the proposed mitigation measures to protect marine ecology. The proposed marine park would connect the existing Sha Chau and Lung Kwu Chau Marine Park to its north and the committed marine park at the Brothers to the east, forming a huge continuous stretch of marine protected area of size as large as 5 200 hectares. It was expected that the synergy effect thus gained would contribute significantly to the long-term conservation of CWDs. For the two marine parks to be designated at Southwest Lantau and Soko Islands, AFCD planned to launch public consultation in mid 2015 and sought to complete the required procedures for the designation by 2017.

29. GM, E(P)/AAHK further explained that as proposed in the EIA report, when 3RS commissioned in 2023, the South Runway would be put on standby mode between 11:00 pm to 7:00 am on the following day, where possible, to minimize aircraft noise impact on North Lantau. By then, the NEF25 contour would shift northward, further away from Tung Chung and the North Lantau areas. As such, the noise impact on North Lantau would be greatly improved. While the capacity of HKIA would increase to 620 000 flight movements per year after the commissioning of 3RS, the utilization of the three runways might not be evenly split. To cultivate a better understanding of the 3RS project among the public, AAHK had also organized more than 10 briefings and meetings to explain the technical and non-technical aspects of the EIA report and the project to the residents of Sha Lo Wan Village and San Tau Village. After the briefings and meetings, AAHK had relayed residents' environmental concerns to relevant Government departments and authorities for follow up as necessary.

30. GM, E(P)/AAHK reiterated that AAHK had conducted a preliminary research on SROI case studies worldwide. The research findings showed that there was no internationally recognized standards and approaches for conducting SROI studies particularly for mega infrastructure projects. In this connection, AAHK considered SROI not applicable for the 3RS project. Separately, AAHK had conducted a study to assess carbon emission associated with the project, which revealed that the economic benefits of the project was far more significant than the environmental costs of carbon emissions.

Action

Discussion

31. Mr Tony TSE sought elaboration on the mitigation measures to combat the aircraft noise problem in Sha Lo Wan Village before the commissioning of 3RS. DDEP(1) advised that the administrative EIA for the Chep Lap Kok airport was conducted before the enactment of the EIAO whereas the current 3RS EIA was a statutory one with an EP issued. The construction and operation of 3RS would need to fully comply with the EP conditions.

32. GM, E(P)/AAHK supplemented that CAD had continued its effort in exploring and implementing all practicable aircraft noise mitigation measures. These included requiring aircraft to adopt the noise abatement take-off and landing procedures, prohibiting landing or taking off of aircraft which did not comply with the relevant noise standards stipulated in Annex 16 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation, encouraging airlines to use quieter aircraft, etc. He further advised that at commencement of HKIA operation in 1998, AAHK had granted a one-off cash allowance to Sha Lo Wan Village residents for the installation of noise insulation facilities. To further assist residents of the affected villages to improve their living environment, AAHK planned to provide a one-off grant of \$65,000 for each storey of village house for carrying out improvement works.

33. Mr Tony TSE commented that the one-off measures might not be adequate to address nearby residents' concern on noise nuisance. Ms LI Sau-mui who was an indigenous resident of Sha Lo Wan Village also criticized the Administration and AAHK for failing to formulate effective measures to minimize the impact of aircraft noise on the village. She further expressed dissatisfaction that since the commissioning of HKIA in 1998, applications for building small houses in the village within the coverage of NEF 25 contour had not been processed and the affected indigenous residents had not been granted any compensation. In view of the increase in the number of flights in recent years, Ms LI was concerned that upon the commissioning of the third runway, the area exposed to aircraft noise might be further extended.

34. GM, E(P)/AAHK reiterated that as proposed in the EIA report, when 3RS in place, the South Runway would be put on standby mode between 11:00 pm to 7:00 am on the following day, where possible, to minimize aircraft noise impact on North Lantau. DDEP(1) stressed that EPD had considered the EIA report of the 3RS project strictly in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the EIAO.

35. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, Mr TSE Sai-kit, Convenor of Save Lantau Alliance, said that although AAHK would conduct EM&A during

Action

both the construction and operation phases of the 3RS project, the project might cause serious and even irreversible damage to the environment and marine ecology. The Administration should therefore carefully assess the possible environmental impacts of the 3RS project before construction and strike an appropriate balance between conservation and development.

36. DDEP(1) stressed that EPD had reviewed the EIA report of the 3RS project strictly in accordance with the requirements, principles and procedures stipulated under the EIAO and the EIA report of the project had met the requirements of the EIA Study Brief and the TM-EIAO. The Administration would closely monitor AAHK to conduct EM&A to ensure that the 3RS project would be designed, constructed and operated in accordance with the recommendations contained in the EIA report as well as the EP conditions.

Session Four

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

37. At the invitation of the Chairman, a total of 16 deputations/individuals presented their views on the expansion of HKIA into 3RS and its related impacts on the environment. A summary of the views of these deputations/individuals was in the **Annex**.

Response by the Administration

38. In response to the views and concerns raised by deputations/individuals, DDEP(1) stressed that the EIA process was an open and transparent statutory process. It provided a platform for striking an appropriate balance between nature conservation and development. Under the EIA mechanism, the proponent of a designated project was required to prepare an EIA report in accordance with the Study Brief and the TM-EIAO. The TM-EIAO set out the principles, procedures, guidelines, requirements and objective criteria for deciding whether the designated project was environmentally acceptable. In deciding whether the EIA report of the 3RS project should be approved, EPD had carefully considered the comments of ACE and those received during the public inspection period as well as the advice from relevant Government departments and authorities under the TM-EIAO (e.g. AFCD to advise on ecology, MD on marine safety and CAD on aircraft related issues) in accordance with the statutory procedures and objective requirements under the TM-EIAO. He explained that the 3RS EIA was a statutory one with an EP issued, which was a unique system used in Hong Kong to effect statutory control on the environmental performance during the construction and operation of the project.

Action

To ensure that the 3RS project would be designed, constructed and operated in accordance with the recommendations contained in the EIA report as well as the EP conditions, AAHK would conduct comprehensive EM&A during both the construction and operation phases of the project. In addition, a full-time on-site Independent Environmental Checker would be engaged to audit the EM&A performance. The Independent Environmental Checker would notify DEP direct if any non-compliance was identified. The results and findings of each audit would also be documented in regular EM&A reports submitted to DEP. He stressed that EPD would conduct close monitoring of the EP compliance and take enforcement action in case detecting non-compliance. In case a person holding an EP holder needed to make changes to his project design which would affect its environmental performance, an application for a variation of the conditions of the EP would be required together with an assessment to demonstrate the environmental acceptability for the variations sought.

39. As regards the concerns about public health, DDEP(1) advised that the EIA report of the 3RS project had included health impact assessments which had been vetted by the Department of Health. Since different projects would lead to emissions of different air pollutants, the nature of a project would be taken into account in deciding whether an air pollutant arising from a project was significant and should be assessed. Ozone was not a pollutant directly emitted from a pollution source but a secondary pollutant formed by the photochemical process under the influence of primary pollutants emitted from regional sources. A project such as the 3RS would emit nitrogen oxide ("NO"), which would react with ozone to form nitrogen dioxide. The project would effectively reduce the level of ozone in its vicinity. Hence ozone was not selected as one of the pollutants to be assessed in any EIA study for project emitting NO, including the 3RS project. In fact, the ozone assessment issue had been raised in a number of judicial review cases and the court considered that the current practice for ozone assessment met the statutory requirements. DDEP(1) also clarified that the 3RS EIA had assessed the cumulative environmental impacts of the project and other related committed/planned projects in the vicinity.

40. GM, E(P)/AAHK supplemented that the EIA report of the 3RS project had assessed the operational phase air quality impacts at all major air sensitive receivers within five kilometers from the project boundary and the project had achieved full compliance with the Air Quality Objectives.

41. ADAFC(C&MP) advised that in the EIA process, AFCD would advise on matters relating to nature conservation, ecological assessment, fisheries, etc. The 18 proposed mitigation measures and four recommendations put forth by ACE were considered effective in enhancing protection of ecology. The designation of a new marine park of about 2 400 hectares and the establishment

Action

of the Fisheries Enhancement Fund were some of the proposed mitigation measures to protect marine ecology and enhance fisheries resources. The proposed marine park would connect the existing Sha Chau and Lung Kwu Chau Marine Park to its north and the committed marine park at the Brothers to the east, forming a huge continuous stretch of marine protected area of size as large as 5 200 hectares. It was expected that the synergy effect thus gained would contribute significantly to the long-term conservation of CWDs.

42. GM, E(P)/AAHK advised that AAHK had relayed the concerns of San Tau Village residents about road improvements and applications for building small houses in the village to relevant Government departments and authorities for follow up as necessary. To assist San Tau Village residents to improve their living environment, AAHK planned to provide a one-off grant of \$65,000 for each storey of village house for carrying out improvement works. AAHK would also provide another one-off grant of \$96,000 for each storey of village house in San Tau Village upon application for installing noise abatement facilities. AAHK would continue to maintain open and proactive communication with affected residents to enhance their understanding of the 3RS project.

43. On airspace management, GM, E(P)/AAHK advised that CAD was responsible for the control of movement of aircraft within Hong Kong's airspace. According to his understanding, a tripartite working group, namely the PRD Region Air Traffic Management Planning and Implementation Supervisory Group, had been set up in 2004 by CAD, the Civil Aviation Administration of China and the Civil Aviation Authority of Macau to rationalize the use of airspace and air traffic management so as to accommodate the rising demand of aviation of the entire PRD region. Taking into account the expansion plans of the airports in PRD, the tripartite working group had formulated a comprehensive plan to rationalize airspace design and planning, including the development of flight paths for 3RS in accordance with the international standards and recommendations promulgated by ICAO.

Discussion

44. The Chairman noted that some residents of San Tau Village were concerned about the light and air pollution caused by HKIA nearby. DDEP(1) explained that the EIA report of the 3RS project had included health impact assessments and a number of initiatives had been put in place to reduce the potential air quality and health impacts associated with the project to an acceptable level. Whilst project proponents were not required to conduct studies on light pollution for their designated projects under the EIAO, the Administration would work closely with AAHK to formulate mitigation

Action

measures to reduce the impacts of light pollution on residents living near HKIA.

Concluding remarks

45. The Chairman thanked deputations/individuals who had attended the meeting to express their views on the 3RS project. He urged the Administration and AAHK to take full account of the views of different stakeholders and accord great importance to addressing the environmental impacts associated with the project.

III. Any other business

46. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:06 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
19 March 2015

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Special meeting on

Tuesday, 6 January 2015, at 9:00 am

Meeting to receive views on "Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System and its related impacts on the environment"

Summary of views and concerns expressed by deputations/individuals

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
<u>Session One</u>		
1.	Green Sense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Opposed the implementation of the three-Runway System ("3RS") project in the Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA"). ● Expressed concern about airspace restrictions. ● The public was not informed of the implications of the Mainland's airspace control on HKIA's runway capacity. ● Park Island in Ma Wan was subject to serious noise impact from HKIA operation. The noise problem would deteriorate with the commissioning of the third runway.
2.	Friends of the Earth (HK)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed disappointment that the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") had approved the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") report commissioned by the Airport Authority Hong Kong ("AAHK"), and granted the Environmental Permit ("EP") to AAHK albeit that the EIA report had little credibility. ● Urged that the construction cost should be closely monitored by the Legislative Council to ensure that the 3RS project would be compatible with the principle of prudent financial management and public interests at large.
3.	New People's Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● HKIA played a pivotal role in maintaining Hong Kong's economic success and sustainable developments. ● If HKIA became saturated without the third runway, it could not maintain its competitive edge among neighbouring airports.
4.	Mr Dominic YIN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Commended AAHK for its professional EIA report on 3RS project. ● Suggested that AAHK should solicit support from local communities for the 3RS project.
5.	Hong Kong Economic & Trade Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)396/14-15(01) (Chinese version only)

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
6.	Hong Kong Professionals And Senior Executives Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(01) (Chinese version only)
7.	Mr Simon LEE Siu-po	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● In light of the imminent saturation of the two-runway system ("2RS"), quite a number of flights had been delayed in landing at HKIA and had to lengthen flight times, resulting in a higher cost of aircraft fuel, and more carbon emissions, etc.
8.	Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)402/14-15(01)
9.	Ms SO Lai-chun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)401/14-15(01) (Chinese version only)
10.	The Hong Kong Institute of Planners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed doubt on the need for 3RS in HKIA. ● The commissioning of the third runway would influence air quality and aggravate noise problems in Tung Chung.
11.	The Kowloon Taxi Owners Association Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● Hong Kong might lose out in the regional competition if the 3RS project would not be implemented. Besides, the aviation and relevant industries would be seriously affected. ● The 3RS project would maintain Hong Kong's position as the international and regional aviation and logistics hub. ● Agreed that the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA report should minimize the environmental impact of the 3RS project.
12.	Hong Kong Taxi Owners' Association Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)401/14-15(02) (Chinese version only)
13.	Hong Kong Dolphin Conservation Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The EIA report was unacceptable as the proposed mitigation and compensation measures had not adequately addressed the concerns about air quality, noise impacts and marine ecology. ● Expressed concern that the 3RS project would turn out to be a white elephant. ● Expressed doubt on the need for 3RS in HKIA and suggested that the resources required for its implementation should be deployed for providing more support for young people.
14.	Asian Institute of Supply Chain and Logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● Expressed concern about the environmental problems generated by frequent air traffic. ● Trusted that the 3RS project would not turn out to be a white elephant as the capacity of HKIA would increase substantially with 3RS in place.

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
15.	Hong Kong Construction Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● Trusted that the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA report should minimize the environmental impact of the 3RS project. ● The 3RS project would provide employment opportunities and enhance Hong Kong's long term development.
16.	Hong Kong Association of China Travel Organisers Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(04) (Chinese version only)
17.	Mr Holden CHOW Ho-ding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed 3RS project would provide employment opportunities, in particular for residents in Tung Chung, and maintain Hong Kong's position as the international and regional aviation and logistics hub. ● The Administration should closely monitor and ensure the mitigation measures as set out in the EIA report were properly implemented. ● Expressed concern about the adverse impacts associated with the 3RS project on the fisheries industry.
18.	Mr HO Hin-ming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Administration should consider commissioning a third party to monitor the progress of the establishment of the proposed marine park and the marine protected area. ● Suggested that the Administration should conduct a comprehensive study on the habitat of Chinese White Dolphins ("CWDs"). ● Kowloon city residents opined that the expansion of HKIA would boost local economy.
19.	Ms HO Ka-po	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The saturation of 2RS was not true and misleading. ● The existing "air wall" restrictions imposed by the Mainland authorities had limited the practical maximum capacity of HKIA's two runways. ● Unless the problem of "air wall" could be solved, the effectiveness of the proposed 3RS in expanding the runway capacity remained very doubtful. ● Suggested cutting flight routes between Hong Kong and Mainland's secondary cities.
20.	Hong Kong Inbound Tour Operators Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● The travel industry had always been Hong Kong's one of the major economic driving force. If the development of HKIA lagged behind other nearby airports, Hong Kong might lose its edge as a premier tourist destination.

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
21.	Hong Kong Airport Services Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● Welcomed any commercially and operationally viable measures to improve the airport environment, including the replacement of the airside saloon vehicle fleet with electric vehicles by end of 2017, and the introduction of more electric vehicles and electric ground support equipment at HKIA. ● Keen to maintain Hong Kong's status as an international aviation and logistics hub.
22.	Air Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● Acknowledged the importance of achieving a balance between the environmental considerations and economic benefits of developing a new runway. ● In order to maintain Hong Kong's position as an air cargo hub, it was vital that HKIA should keep pace with the growing aviation trends in the region.
23.	Airline Operators Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project and opined that Hong Kong should expedite the implementation of the 3RS project. ● Many airlines operating at HKIA had been making substantial investments in modern and environmental friendly aircraft. ● The International Air Transport Association ("IATA") had formulated plans to help airlines to meet a number of environmental targets, including a reduction in CO2 emissions.
24.	Hong Kong Dragon Airlines Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project and opined that Hong Kong should expedite the implementation of the 3RS project. ● IATA had formulated plans to help airlines to meet a number of environmental targets, including a reduction in CO2.
25.	Cathay Pacific Catering Services (HK) Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● It was part of the expansion plan to reduce carbon emission through deployment of environmental friendly vehicles and the use of advanced energy saving equipments. ● Hong Kong should expedite the implementation of the 3RS project as well as the mitigation measures as set out in the EIA report.
26.	Cathay Pacific Airways Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● Welcomed that EPD had granted an EP to AAHK. ● The airline had been making investments in modernizing their fleets with more advanced, fuel efficient and quieter aircraft.

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
27.	Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● Acknowledged the importance of achieving a balance between the environmental considerations and economic benefits of developing a new runway. ● Urged that AAHK should maintain close communication with all stakeholders in the implementation process, so that the proposed mitigation measures would be conducted in an effective manner.
28.	Mr MAK Chi-kit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The existing "air wall" restrictions imposed by the Mainland authorities had limited the practical maximum capacity of HKIA's two runways. ● Expressed doubt on the credibility of the EIA report. ● Hong Kong should learn from the lesson of the development of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link which had turned out to be a white elephant.
29.	Hong Kong Project Management Exchange Centre Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The 3RS project should be implemented as soon as practicable since any delay might lead to higher construction cost in light of inflation. ● Agreed that the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA report should minimize the environmental impact of the 3RS project. ● The EIA process should be forward-looking. ● Suggested that Hong Kong should develop an additional airport in the long run.
30.	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"> ● Expressed doubt on the need for 3RS project. ● 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. ● The Administration should suspend the 3RS project in view of controversial feedback from the community.
31.	Hong Kong Small and Medium Enterprises Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● The 3RS project could benefit aviation, travel and construction industries, attract foreign investments, boost the local economy and reduce the operation cost of small and medium enterprises. ● Hong Kong should develop the third runway to maintain its competitive edge when neighbouring airports were developing rapidly.
<u>Session Two</u>		
32.	Miss LAI Tsz-yan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Opposed the implementation of the 3RS project. ● Expressed concern about the conservation of CWDs and the impact on their habitats arising from the construction works

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>of the 3RS project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The commissioning of the third runway would increase carbon emissions and aggravate noise problems to Tung Chung residents. ● Suggested that resources required for the implementation of 3RS project should be deployed for tackling more pressing livelihood issues.
33.	DHL Aviation (Hong Kong) Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● HKIA had been the world's busiest cargo airport since 2010. ● Pleased to note that AAHK would spearhead a series of measures for improving the environment in particular in connection with air quality and aircraft noise. ● Hong Kong should maintain its status as an international aviation hub and a logistics hub.
34.	Cathay Pacific Services Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● HKIA had been the world's busiest cargo airport since 2010. Over the past 15 years, the compound annual growth of air cargo throughput at HKIA was 7% on average. ● Acknowledged the importance of achieving a balance between the environmental considerations and economic benefits of developing a new runway. ● Believed that AAHK would put efforts in implementing effective measures to mitigate the environmental impacts caused by the 3RS project.
35.	Innovation and Technology Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(02) (English version only)
36.	Asia Airfreight Terminal Company Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)401/14-15(03) (English version only)
37.	Mr AU YEUNG Kwok-wah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(06) (Chinese version only)
38.	Ms LEE Ching-yi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Opposed the implementation of the 3RS project. ● Expressed concern about the conservation of CWDs and the impact on their habitats arising from the construction works of the 3RS project. ● Urged that the Administration should adopt a "Conservation before Construction" principle in implementing the 3RS project. ● Disagreed to focus only on the benefits of the 3RS project but not its disadvantages.

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
39.	Hong Kong Air Cargo Terminals Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(03) (English version only)
40.	N.T. Taxi Operations Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(04) (Chinese version only)
41.	Mr Thomas LEDGER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(07) (English version only) ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(05) (English version only)
42.	Tung Chung Safe and Healthy City	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● The proposed 3RS project would provide employment opportunities, and benefit tourism, catering and retail industries. ● In light of the imminent saturation of 2RS, quite a number of arrival flights had to hover in the air to wait for landing, resulting in adverse environmental impacts.
43.	Ms LAU Suk-han	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tung Chung residents expressed support for the 3RS project. ● The proposed 3RS project would provide employment opportunities and increase upward mobility opportunities for young people. ● Expressed concern about the limited capacity of HKIA. ● Hong Kong should expedite the establishment of the proposed marine park for CWDs.
44.	China Aircraft Services Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)396/14-15(02) (Chinese version only)
45.	Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(08) (English version only)
46.	Ms YEUNG Ching-nga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Opposed the implementation of the 3RS project. ● Expressed concern about the conservation of CWDs. ● Expressed doubt on the need for 3RS in HKIA and suggested that resources required for its implementation should be deployed for tackling more pressing livelihood issues.
47.	Mr LEUNG Chun-hin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Opposed the implementation of the 3RS project. ● Expressed concern that Hong Kong attached too much importance to infrastructure development and ignored environmental protection.
48.	Miss SU Tsz-ki	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed doubt on the need for 3RS in HKIA and sought the Administration's elaboration on the forecasts made in "HKIA Mater Plan 2030". ● Suggested that AAHK should conduct Strategic Environmental Assessment to evaluate the potential

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		cumulative impacts associated with the 3RS project.
49.	Miss YU Hin-pik	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Disagreed to focus only on the benefits of the 3RS project but not its disadvantages. ● Many green groups had raised concerns on the adverse environmental impacts of the 3RS project and its high construction cost of \$200 billion. ● As set out in the EIA report, the proposed mitigation and compensation measures had not adequately addressed the concerns about air quality, conservation of CWDs, etc.
50.	Mr KWOK Ho-man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Opposed the implementation of the 3RS project. ● Expressed doubt on the need for 3RS in HKIA and suggested that resources required for its implementation should be deployed for tackling more pressing livelihood issues. ● Expressed concern about the noise impact arising from the operation of HKIA.
51.	Miss KAM Ka-man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Opposed the implementation of the 3RS project. ● Expressed concern about the conservation of CWDs. ● Suggested that resources required for the 3RS project should be deployed for tackling more pressing livelihood issues.
52.	The Lion Rock Institute (HK)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Higher passenger and cargo throughputs could be achieved if air service operators would be encouraged to deploy bigger aircrafts for use at HKIA. ● Suggested that the Administration should conduct tagging studies on CWDs to monitor their conservation status.
53.	香港工商總會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● The proposed 3RS project would benefit economic development and provide employment opportunities. ● A considerable number of flights had been delayed in landing at HKIA due to limited runway capacity, resulting in a higher cost of aircraft fuel, and adverse environmental impacts.
54.	荃灣各界協會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● 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 provide job opportunities. ● Hong Kong should expedite the implementation of the 3RS project as any delay might lead to higher construction cost.
55.	荃灣青年會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● The proposed 3RS project would provide employment opportunities for Tsuen Wan young people. ● Trusted that the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
		<p>report could minimize the environmental impact of the 3RS project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hong Kong should expedite the implementation of the 3RS project as any delay might lead to higher construction cost.
56.	Liberal Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● The Liberal Party had conducted an opinion poll, in which 54% of people were satisfied with the EIA report and 67% of people surveyed supported the 3RS project. ● HKIA was facing intensifying competition among other airports in Asia. Hong Kong might lose out in the competition if the 3RS project would not be implemented.
57.	Liberal Party Youth Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed disappointment about the delay in implementation of the 3RS project. ● Hong Kong should expedite the implementation of the 3RS project as any delay might lead to higher construction cost. ● Many opinion polls showed that a majority of people had expressed support for the 3RS project. ● If the development of HKIA lagged behind other nearby airports, Hong Kong might lose its competitive edge.
58.	本土機場發展聯盟	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● CWDs would adjust themselves in face of changes in marine environment and gradually adapt to the changes. ● Trusted that the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA report could minimize the environmental impact of the 3RS project.
59.	機場發展關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● If HKIA became saturated without the third runway, the aviation and relevant industries would be seriously affected. The operation cost of small and medium enterprises would be increased inevitably, resulting in higher unemployment rate. ● Hong Kong should expedite the implementation of the 3RS project.
60.	第三條跑道關注組	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed support for the 3RS project. ● The construction of the third runway would enable HKIA to cope with the growth in freight. ● Hong Kong should develop the third runway to maintain its competitive edge when neighbouring airports were developing rapidly.
61.	Hong Kong Young Industrialists Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(09) (Chinese version only)

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
<u>Session Three</u>		
62.	Worldwide Flight Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(10) (English version only)
63.	Hong Kong Airport Ramp Services Employees Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(06) (Chinese version only)
64.	The Staffs & Workers Union of Hong Kong Civil Airlines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(07) (Chinese version only)
65.	Hong Kong Air Cargo Terminals Employees Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(08) (Chinese version only)
66.	民航東涌地區幹事會	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(09) (Chinese version only)
67.	Save Lantau Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Opposed the implementation of the 3RS project. ● The EIA process was not equitable. There should be a public consultation exercise regarding the proposed marine park. ● Expressed concern on the air pollution problems in Tung Chung. ● Urged that a baseline assessment should be conducted to ascertain the environmental carrying capacity before starting off various infrastructure projects in Lantau.
68.	Civic Party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● HKIA and the Administration should provide more raw data on the situation of the 3RS project for public reference. ● The proposed mitigation and compensation measures had not adequately addressed the concerns about air quality. Air pollution problem in Tung Chung had worsened in recent years. ● According to the statistics of the Hedley Environmental Index, the operation of the 3RS project would incur huge social costs. AAHK was urged to conduct an assessment of Social Return on Investment for the 3RS project.
69.	Eco Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Expressed concern about the conservation of CWDs. ● Hong Kong, being a metropolitan city, should be able to balance the needs of environmental protection and economic development.
70.	Mr LEE Chi-fung	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(10) (Chinese version only)
71.	Mr MAN Wai-cheong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(11) (Chinese version only)

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
72.	Mr KUNG Hok-sing	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(12) (Chinese version only)
73.	Mr CHAN Wan-sum	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(13) (Chinese version only)
74.	Mr CHEUNG Kwong-yam	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(14) (Chinese version only)
75.	Ms LI Sau-mui	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(16) (Chinese version only)
76.	Ms LEE Sau-lan	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(17) (Chinese version only)
<u>Session Four</u>		
77.	Mr CHENG Chu-hung	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(18) (Chinese version only)
78.	Ms CHUI Shing-fan	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(19) (Chinese version only)
79.	San Tau Village	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(20) (Chinese version only)
80.	Miss TSE Kwai-ying	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(21) (Chinese version only)
81.	Mr TSE King-tin	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(22) (Chinese version only)
82.	Ms TSE Lai-ngo	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(23) (Chinese version only)
83.	Mr TSE Kwok-hong	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(24) (Chinese version only)
84.	Mr TSE Chi-hang	● Raised no comment.
85.	Mr CHOW Yiu-jo	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(25) (Chinese version only)
86.	Ms TSE Kwai-ying	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(26) (Chinese version only)
87.	Hong Kong Institution of Highways and Transportation	● LC Paper No. CB(1)396/14-15(03) (English version only)
88.	HK Wildlife.net	● LC Paper No. CB(1)396/14-15(04) (Chinese version only)
89.	Miss NG Ching-yan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The EIA process was not equitable and transparent. The EIA report neither mentioned about the impacts of the ozone concentration associated with the 3RS project nor reflected the cumulative environmental impacts arising from other concurrent projects in the adjoining areas. ● Expressed concern about the conservation of CWDs. ● Unless the problem of "air wall" could be solved, the effectiveness of the proposed 3RS in expanding the runway capacity remained very doubtful.

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission / Major views and concerns
90.	Mr TAM Cheuk-man	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Disagreed to focus only on the benefits of the 3RS project but not its disadvantages. ● Expressed concern that Hong Kong attached too much importance to infrastructure development and ignored environmental protection.
91.	Clean Air Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The EIA report did not mention about the impacts of the ozone concentration associated with the 3RS project. ● Tung Chung residents had been suffering from high concentration of ozone due to the regional influence.
92.	Tradeport Hong Kong Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Raised no comment.

Submissions from parties not attending the meeting

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission
1.	United Friendship Taxi Owners and Drivers Association Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(02) (Chinese version only)
2.	Momentum 107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(03) (Chinese version only)
3.	Mr HO Pun-hon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(05) (Chinese version only)
4.	Green Lantau Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(11) (English version only)
5.	Tsuen Wan Rural Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(12) (Chinese version only)
6.	Waihong Environmental Services Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(13) (English version only)
7.	Construction Industry Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(14) (English version only)
8.	Mr Manson HUNG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(15) (Chinese version only)
9.	Mr WONG Kam-chiu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(16) (Chinese version only)
10.	Hong Kong Hotels Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(17) (English version only)
11.	Serco Group (HK) Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(18) (English version only)

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission
12.	Tuen Mun Respect for the Aged Association	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(19) (Chinese version only)
13.	Nixon Cleaning Company Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(20) (English version only)
14.	Raffles Medical Group (HK)	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(21) (English version only)
15.	Mr MAK Wing-wah	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(22) (Chinese version only)
16.	Plaza Premium Lounge Management Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(23) (English version only)
17.	Founding President of the Hong Kong Environmental Industry Association cum Chairman of Group 26 (Environmental Industry) of the Federation of Hong Kong Industries	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(24) (Chinese version only)
18.	Federation of Hong Kong Industries	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(25) (Chinese version only)
19.	Mr WONG Wai-kit	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(26) (Chinese version only)
20.	香港工商網會青年網絡主席	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(27) (Chinese version only)
21.	Pricewaterhouse Coopers	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(28) (Chinese version only)
22.	The Hong Kong Shippers' Council	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(29) (Chinese version only)
23.	Trans-Island Limousine Service Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(30) (English version only)
24.	Mr LAM Chiu-ying	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(31) (Chinese version only)
25.	Chairman, Federation of Hong Kong Industries Group 21	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(32) (Chinese version only)

No.	Name of deputation/individual	Submission
26.	Chairman, Federation of Hong Kong Industries Group 4 Electrical & Optical Projects	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(33) (Chinese version only)
27.	The Chinese Manufacturers' Association of Hong Kong	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(34) (Chinese version only)
28.	Chairman, Federation of Hong Kong Industries Group 23	● LC Paper No. CB(1)378/14-15(35) (Chinese version only)
29.	WWF Hong Kong	● LC Paper No. CB(1)396/14-15(05) (Chinese version only)
30.	Chairman, Federation of Hong Kong Industries Group 11	● LC Paper No. CB(1)396/14-15(06) (Chinese version only)
31.	Tai Wo Motors Limited	● LC Paper No. CB(1)396/14-15(07) (Chinese version only)
32.	王偉英先生	● LC Paper No. CB(1)396/14-15(08) (Chinese version only)
33.	Mr LEE Tai-pang	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(15) (Chinese version only)
34.	Miss YAU Pui-man	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(27) (Chinese version only)
35.	Miss TSE Shui-lin	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(28) (Chinese version only)
36.	British Airway	● LC Paper No. CB(1)420/14-15(29) (English version only)