

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(1)976/14-15

Ref : CB1/PL/EA

Report of the Panel on Environmental Affairs for submission to the Legislative Council

Purpose

This report gives an account of the work of the Panel on Environmental Affairs ("the Panel") during the 2014-2015 Legislative Council ("LegCo") session. It will be tabled at the meeting of the Council on 24 June 2015 in accordance with Rule 77(14) of the Rules of Procedure of the Council.

The Panel

2. The Panel was formed by a resolution passed by the Council on 8 July 1998 and as amended on 20 December 2000, 9 October 2002, 11 July 2007 and 2 July 2008 for the purpose of monitoring and examining Government policies and issues of public concern relating to environmental and conservation matters. The terms of reference of the Panel are given in **Appendix I**.

3. The Panel comprises 24 members, with Hon CHAN Hak-kan and Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman respectively. The membership list of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

Major Work

Waste management

Municipal solid waste charging

4. Issues relating to waste management remained high on the agenda of the Panel. At its meeting on 25 February 2015, the Panel discussed the Government's framework proposal for implementation of municipal solid waste ("MSW") charging and a related staffing proposal. Members generally

supported the introduction of MSW charging in Hong Kong as this could incentivize the public to reduce, separate and recycle waste with vigor. Members were, however, concerned that the charging scheme might pose a financial burden on low-income families, and opined that the Administration should address the needs of people with financial hardship when determining the level of MSW charge. The Administration advised that while the MSW charge should not be excessive, it should be set at levels sufficient to incentivize waste reduction. Given that MSW charging was a quantity-based charging mechanism, members of the public would pay less if they produced less waste.

5. Some members expressed concern about aggravation of fly-tipping and the environmental hygiene problems that might be caused by the reduced provision of public litter bins after implementation of MSW charging. They urged the Administration to assist owners of old private buildings to set up owners' corporations and engage property management companies to co-ordinate waste disposal activities. They also requested the Administration to explore the feasibility of adopting modern technology to record and trace waste to its source, and take the lead in building design and urban planning to facilitate waste separation and collection. The Administration indicated that it would explore and formulate suitable complementary measures to tie in with the implementation of the charging scheme.

6. Members generally considered that while MSW charging could motivate people to discard less, the Administration should continue with its efforts to expedite the implementation of viable measures to promote recycling at the community level. It should proactively foster a favourable environment for the development of the recycling industry, and improve the recycling network to help the public segregate recyclables properly from the waste stream for reuse or recovery.

Producer Responsibility Scheme on Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment

7. As committed under "Hong Kong: Blueprint for Sustainable Use of Resources 2013-2022" published in May 2013, the Government has been progressively implementing mandatory producer responsibility schemes ("PRs") for various products based on the "polluter pays" principle. On 26 January 2015, the Panel was briefed on the latest development in implementation of the mandatory PRS on waste electrical and electronic equipment ("WEEE"), including the necessary legislative proposals for establishing the statutory regulatory framework. The Administration introduced into LegCo in March 2015 the Promotion of Recycling and Proper Disposal (Electrical Equipment and Electrical Equipment) (Amendment) Bill 2015 to implement the PRS on WEEE. The Bill is being studied by a Bills Committee.

8. Under the mandatory PRS on WEEE, the Government proposed to regulate five types of products namely (i) washing machines, (ii) refrigerators, (iii) air conditioners, (iv) television sets and (v) computer products viz. computers (i.e. desktops, laptops and tablets), printers, scanners and monitors (collectively known as "regulated electrical equipment ("REE")"), which accounted for about 85% of WEEE generated locally. While the Panel was generally supportive of introducing mandatory PRS on WEEE, members expressed various views on the details of implementation.

9. Noting that recycling fees would be imposed and collected from REE suppliers to recover the full costs of the mandatory PRS on WEEE, members were concerned that the fees might ultimately be shifted wholly or partially to consumers, thus posing a financial burden on them. This would defeat the purpose of PRS which sought to engage stakeholders to share the responsibility for the treatment or disposal of end-of-life REE products. The Administration advised that collecting the recycling fees from REE suppliers after the relevant REE had been distributed in Hong Kong could achieve a proper balance among different considerations, including the views collected from the relevant trades, their modes of operation and administrative convenience.

10. In view of the novelties in the functions and designs of electronic equipment, some members urged the Administration to provide clear definitions for the five types of REE in the relevant legislation to avoid ambiguous interpretation. In parallel, the Administration should step up publicity and public education to prepare the community for the mandatory PRS on WEEE, including enhancing public understanding of the collection and recycling services to be provided by REE sellers or their appointed service providers.

11. Since the disposal of WEEE on land or in premises with an area over 100 m² would be required to obtain a waste disposal licence under the mandatory PRS on WEEE, some members expressed concern that some WEEE recyclers might undertake the process on a small scale to circumvent the licensing requirement. The Administration advised that local WEEE processing facilities usually required large operation space to carry out proper treatment and recycling of WEEE. The proposed licensing control could effectively bring most WEEE recycling operations under regulation while avoiding undue impact on small-scale recycling business. Members requested the Administration to perform regular checks and inspections to ensure that the treatment process carried out by WEEE recyclers exempted from licensing control was conducted in an environmentally sound manner.

Producer Responsibility Scheme on glass beverage bottles

12. On 27 April 2015, the Panel received an update on the preparatory work for introducing a mandatory PRS on glass beverage bottles ("GBBs"), including the necessary legislative proposals for establishing the statutory regulatory framework.

13. While the Panel in principle supported the mandatory PRS on GBBs, some members expressed concern about the lack of sustainable outlets for waste glass and doubted whether the target of recovering 50 000 tonnes of waste glass bottles per annum could be achieved. They cautioned that the high transportation cost incurred in the collection of waste glass bottles might undermine the cost-effectiveness of the scheme.

14. The Administration pointed out that the mandatory PRS on GBBs would be implemented on a territory-wide scale and hence, the collection and recycling of waste glass bottles would benefit from economy of scale. The Administration would increase the number of glass bottle collection points and expand the collection network to cover food and beverage facilities, particularly bars and restaurants, to facilitate bulk collection of waste glass bottles. The waste glass bottles collected would be crushed into cullet for use as construction materials, such as eco-pavers and partition bricks. Glass cullet of appropriate size could be used as fill materials in reclamation and other earthworks, and might also substitute river sand. The Administration would also promote the use of eco-pavers in public works projects through the green procurement policy.

15. On the recycling fee for glass-bottled beverages to be imposed and collected from registered suppliers, some members considered that such charging arrangement might not create sufficient incentive for consumers to reduce their use of glass bottles. Moreover, the requirement that registered suppliers had to submit to the Government periodic returns on the computation of the recycling fee payable and engage an independent auditor to conduct annual audits on the returns would incur administrative costs to registered suppliers.

16. The Administration explained that the mandatory PRS on GBBs did not seek to discourage the public from using glass bottles but to establish a circular economy for waste glass. It would take into account the operation of beverage and wine suppliers when working out the detailed reporting requirements. Since exports of locally manufactured glass-bottled beverages and re-exports of imported glass-bottled beverages would be exempted from paying the recycling fee, it was envisaged that Hong Kong's status as a regional wine hub would not be undermined by the initiative.

17. As regards the proposal that registered suppliers might apply for exemption from paying the recycling fee by submitting a corporate reuse/recycling plan on how the waste glass bottles of their brands would be recovered, members urged the Administration to set out clearly the exemption requirements and operational details in the future legislative proposals. The Administration should also enhance public awareness of the "clean recycling" concept, and plan for extending the scheme to cover glass food/sauce bottles.

Extension of Plastic Shopping Bag Charging to all retail outlets

18. The Environmental Levy Scheme on Plastic Shopping Bags ("PSBs") was launched on 7 July 2009 as the first mandatory PRS in Hong Kong. Under the levy scheme, some 3 300 registered retailers were required to charge their customers an amount of \$0.5 as an environmental levy for each PSB provided to them. To further address the problem of excessive PSB use in Hong Kong, the Administration introduced the Product Eco-responsibility (Amendment) Bill 2013 into LegCo on 8 May 2013 to extend the levy scheme to cover all retailers in the territory. The Amendment Bill was approved by LegCo on 19 March 2014.

19. On 15 December 2014, the Panel was briefed on the trade facilitation and publicity actions taken by the Administration to prepare for the implementation of the extended PSB charging effective from 1 April 2015. Some members expressed grave concerns that PSB charging might not be effective in reducing excessive use of PSBs. In particular, the Administration might not have sufficient manpower to conduct surprise checks at retail outlets and conduct follow-up investigations on disputes between customers and retailers over the collection of PSB charge. The Administration advised that after implementation of the Levy Scheme, the number of PSBs distributed to customers by registered retailers had been reduced significantly by up to 90%. Although the number of PSBs disposed of at landfills had increased in recent years according to the landfill surveys, the Administration would continue to organize publicity and public education activities to help reinforce the green message of using reusable shopping bags.

20. Some members criticized the Administration for adopting a "retention" approach under the extended PSB charging whereby a seller would retain the PSB charge collected from customers without the need of remitting it to the Government and keeping related records. They urged the Administration to require all retailers to submit the PSB charge collected to the Government, and provide information on the use of PSBs with a view to facilitating the Administration to monitor the situation of PSB distribution and the effectiveness of the extended PSB charging. There was also a suggestion that the

Administration should impose PSB charge at the wholesale or import level to reduce PSBs at source. The Administration stressed that the absence of statutory record keeping requirements would not undermine the objective of the extension of PSB charging to inculcate behavioural change of customers on using less PSBs. A voluntary reporting system under which retailers would be encouraged to provide information on their PSBs usage on a yearly basis would be implemented through the Hong Kong Retail Management Association.

21. While noting that the Administration would step up public education and publicity to assist the retail trade to comply with the extended PSB charging, members considered that the Administration should further promote the habit of "Bring Your Own Bag" as part of Hong Kong's green culture to encourage the public to switch to reusable shopping bags. The charging scheme should also be publicized to tourists to prevent unnecessary conflicts between them and retailers over whether PSB charge should be collected at the time of sale.

Extension of the Cleaner Production Partnership Programme

22. The Cleaner Production Partnership Programme ("CPPP") is a five-year programme launched by EPD in collaboration with the Economic and Information Commission of Guangdong Province in April 2008. It aims to encourage and facilitate Hong Kong-owned factories in Guangdong and Hong Kong to adopt cleaner production ("CP") technologies and practices. With the approval of the Finance Committee in December 2012, CPPP was extended for two years from 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2015 with \$50 million. At its meeting on 25 February 2015, the Panel was consulted on the Administration's proposal to further extend CPPP for five years up to 31 March 2020 with an additional funding of \$150 million.

23. While members in general supported the extension proposal, some of them queried the effectiveness of CPPP in encouraging Hong Kong-owned factories in Guangdong and Hong Kong to adopt CP technologies and practices, and improving the regional environment. Members also conveyed concerns about the service performance of environmental technology ("ET") service providers who had been supporting CPPP by providing on-site assessments, consultancy services and installation services, etc. to factories in Guangdong and Hong Kong. Given the considerable demand for technical support and know-how in applying CP technologies and practices in the Mainland, a member suggested the Administration assist ET service providers to form partnership with Mainland enterprises to tap new business opportunities in the growing environmental market in Guangdong and other provinces/municipalities of the Mainland.

24. The Administration advised that the demonstration projects sponsored by CPPP as well as the follow-up investments made by participating factories had brought significant environmental and economic benefits to the Pearl River Delta ("PRD") region, and enhanced business opportunities for ET service providers in Hong Kong to gain access to the Guangdong market. In particular, since the Guangdong authorities had been stepping up their efforts to reduce pollution arising from industrial sources, CPPP would facilitate Hong Kong-owned factories to commence CP in a systematic and holistic manner and sustain their business in the province. The Administration advised that if factories participating in CPPP were not satisfied with their ET service providers, they might lodge a complaint to the Administration for investigation.

25. As regards the suggestion from members on extending the coverage of CPPP to other provinces/municipalities of the Mainland so that Hong Kong-owned factories located in areas outside Guangdong would become eligible for applying for funding support from the programme, the Administration advised that the coverage had been widened from nine PRD municipalities to the entire Guangdong Province in 2013. Extending CPPP to other provinces/municipalities of the Mainland outside Guangdong would involve a substantial policy change that required careful consideration.

Air quality

Emission control for non-road mobile machinery

26. On 27 October 2014, the Panel was briefed on the Administration's progress in preparing a subsidiary regulation ("the Regulation") under the Air Pollution Control Ordinance (Cap. 311) to control the air pollutant emissions of non-road mobile machinery ("NRMMs") which included a wide range of mobile or transportable machines or vehicles powered by internal combustion engines used primarily off-road.

27. The Panel generally welcomed the Administration's plan to control the air pollutant emissions of NRMMs and noted that all NRMMs to be sold or leased for use in Hong Kong complying with the emission standards (i.e. European Union Stage IIIA level) as promulgated under the Regulation would be properly labelled for easy identification. However, members expressed divergent views as to whether in-use NRMMs should be exempted from meeting the prescribed emission standards, and whether owners of in-use NRMMs should be granted a grace period of six months to apply for exemption on the machinery concerned. Some members supported the early phasing out of all in-use NRMMs while some other members pointed out that as the machinery types and utilization frequency of NRMMs varied greatly, it might not be feasible to draw up a single mandatory retirement scheme for different types of NRMMs.

28. To further enhance emission control of NRMMs, some members suggested that the Administration should consider retrofitting in-use NRMMs with emission reduction devices (e.g. diesel particulate filters), promoting the wider use of biodiesel and introducing taxation concessions. It should also encourage the construction industry to acquire ISO 14000 certification, which mapped out a framework of effective environmental management standards set by the International Organization for Standardization, to constantly improve the industry's environmental performance. Moreover, an interactive platform should be developed for the Administration to communicate with the construction industry and other relevant stakeholders on emission control for NRMMs.

Progress of setting up low emission zones

29. In the 2010 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced the plan of setting up low emission zones ("LEZs") in Causeway Bay, Central and Mong Kok with the target of having only low emission franchised buses travelling in these zones by 2015. On 23 March 2015, the Panel was briefed on the Administration's progress in setting up LEZs in the three districts.

30. While members supported the setting up of the three LEZs to improve roadside air quality, they commented that the size of each zone was too small covering only a busy corridor. Some members suggested the Administration consider extending the scope of restriction of access to the three LEZs to all types of vehicles failing to meet Euro IV or above emission standards and enlarging the sizes of the zones to further reduce air pollution. The Administration explained that low emission buses deployed to run in the three LEZs would also go through other districts and thus benefit a much wider area. While a bigger LEZ might yield greater air quality benefits, the design of the zone, which involved different parameters including the emission criteria and detection method, should be carefully considered. Apart from establishing LEZs, the Administration would continue to implement different air quality improvement measures to tackle local and regional air pollution.

31. As regards the concern about whether the three franchised bus companies (i.e. The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited, the Citybus Limited and the New World First Bus Services Limited) could meet the target that all their buses travelling in the three LEZs would be low emission buses by end of 2015, the Administration advised that it had been working closely with the franchised bus companies to deploy sufficient low emission buses to the three LEZs, and over 90% of the franchised buses passing the zones would be low emission buses.

32. Some members suggested reducing the fares of cross-harbour tunnel buses (which were mostly low emission buses) after they had crossed the harbour to boost the patronage of cross-harbour tunnel bus services so as to maximize the environmental benefits of these buses. The Administration indicated that the Environment Bureau would discuss with the Transport and Housing Bureau on cross-harbour tunnel bus services, as well as environmental issues relating to bus route rationalization.

Progress of air quality improvement measures

33. On 27 April 2015, the Panel discussed the latest progress of different air quality improvement measures for attaining the Air Quality Objectives ("AQOs") which came into effect on 1 January 2014. The Administration's target is to broadly attain AQOs by 2020.

34. Members noted that an AQO review was required to be conducted at least once every five years as required under the Air Pollution Control Ordinance (Cap. 311). They urged the Administration to kick off the review process as early as possible to devise a new set of AQOs for the five years starting from 1 January 2019 and formulate corresponding air quality improvement plans. As the Administration would report to the Panel in end 2015 the progress of formulating the approach and methodology for conducting the AQO review, members requested the Administration to provide information on the changes in the emission levels of major air pollutants and their possible association with public health, elaborate more on the Air Quality Health Index ("AQHI") and provide health advice to people with different degrees of susceptibility to air pollution when AQHI reached high or above categories. As different districts were susceptible to different air pollutant emission sources, such as power plants, vessels, vehicles, aircrafts, etc., members considered that EPD should identify the major types of air pollution sources in individual districts and formulate specific air quality improvement measures accordingly.

35. As regards the ex-gratia payment scheme for phasing out pre-Euro IV diesel commercial vehicles ("DCVs"), a member urged the Administration to proactively encourage vehicle owners to phase out their pre-Euro IV DCVs earlier than the retirement deadlines stipulated in the relevant legislation and facilitate the transport trade to make necessary preparation and arrangements. The Administration advised that EPD had sent letters to all pre-Euro DCV owners in February 2015 and issued a press release on 2 April 2015 to remind them to replace their vehicles before the respective deadlines. The \$300 million Pilot Green Transport Fund established in March 2011 also provided subsidies to the transport trade to try out green innovative transport technology, including electric vehicles and hybrid vehicles.

36. Some members were concerned about marine emissions which had become the top emitter of the three major air pollutants namely sulphur dioxide ("SO₂"), nitrogen oxides and respirable suspended particulates ("RSP") since 2011. The Administration advised that since the Port Facilities and Light Dues Incentive Scheme had been launched in September 2012 to encourage ocean-going vessels ("OGVs") to switch to low sulphur marine fuel while berthing in Hong Kong waters, there were around 3 000 OGV-calls participating in the scheme a year and as at end of 2014, the participation rate was about 13%. It was expected that when the Air Pollution Control (Ocean Going Vessels) (Fuel at Berth) Regulation took effect from 1 July 2015 to require all OGVs to use marine fuel with sulphur content not exceeding 0.5% while berthing in Hong Kong, the total emissions of SO₂ and RSP would be reduced.

37. On the energy saving front, some members were of the view that as the power companies might not be proactively promoting renewable energy ("RE") due to the high tariff implications, the Administration should take the lead in the further promotion of RE. In this connection, the Panel noted that on 14 May 2015, the Environment Bureau unveiled the "Energy Saving Plan for the Built Environment 2015~2025+", which set out the policy, strategy, target and key actions for achieving a new target of reducing Hong Kong's energy intensity by 40% by 2025. The Administration will brief members on the energy saving plan at the meeting on 22 June 2015.

Provision of on-shore power supply at the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal

38. At its meeting on 2 June 2015, the Panel was briefed on the key findings of a technical feasibility study on the provision of on-shore power supply ("OPS") at the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal ("KTCT") for reducing emission from cruise vessels while berthing, and the recommended way forward.

39. Members noted that while the study had confirmed the technical feasibility of installing OPS at KTCT, only a small number of cruise vessels used OPS at present and major cruise liners preferred to retrofit their vessels with scrubbers to reduce SO₂ and particulate matters emissions. As such, the Administration's recommendation was to keep a close monitoring of international developments, and review the installation of OPS at KTCT as and when there was a rising trend of installation of OPS-capable systems in cruises.

40. Some members agreed that the high capital outlay of OPS facilities coupled with the low interest of cruise liners in equipping their vessels with OPS-capable systems might not justify further pursuit of the initiative, and supported the direction to review the matter later. Some other members, however, expressed disappointment that the Administration would not take the initiative forward at this stage. They were worried that the air pollutants

emitted by cruise vessels at berth would continue to affect air quality and pose health hazards to the Hong Kong public. Besides, as no cruise terminal in Asia had OPS installed currently, it should be strategically worthwhile for Hong Kong to spearhead provision of the facility in the region, with a view to attracting global cruise liners to deploy their OPS-capable cruises to Hong Kong and the PRD region, or retrofit their cruises with OPS-capable systems. The Administration stressed that as current findings indicated that the proposed OPS system at KTCT, if installed, would be significantly underutilized in the foreseeable future, it would be more appropriate to review the matter in the light of international developments.

Environmental Impact Assessment for the Three-Runway System Project

41. On 7 November 2014, the Director of Environmental Protection approved the environmental impact assessment ("EIA") report of the Three-Runway System Project ("the 3RS project") of the Hong Kong International Airport and granted an Environmental Permit ("EP") for the project. As the 3RS project was a topical issue of public concern, the Panel discussed the EIA on the 3RS project at its meeting on 24 November 2014. The Panel also held a special meeting on 6 January 2015 to receive public views on "Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System and its related impacts on the environment".

42. Members expressed grave concern about the potential ecological impacts of the 3RS project. They strongly urged the Administration to adopt a "Conservation before Construction" principle and implement the 18 proposed mitigation measures and four recommendations put forth by the Advisory Council on the Environment to enhance the protection of ecology before commencing the 3RS project. In particular, the Administration should, before taking forward reclamation for the 3RS project, advance the establishment of the proposed new marine park nearby to provide a habitat for Chinese White Dolphins ("CWDs"), and conduct dedicated scientific study on CWDs to ascertain their distribution and abundance in Hong Kong. It should also proactively explore co-operation opportunities with neighbouring Mainland cities on the protection of marine ecology.

43. As a number of major infrastructural projects (e.g. the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge local projects) were under planning or construction near Lantau Island, some members were worried that the 3RS project would further aggravate the air and noise pollution problems in Tung Chung and adversely affect the health of local residents. They called upon the Administration to carefully assess the cumulative environmental impacts of potential or on-going projects in the adjoining areas in order to draw up environmentally acceptable schemes/designs and associated mitigation measures

for the 3RS project. Some other members suggested that local standards for aircraft noise emission should be set to minimize aircraft noise impact on the communities living near the flight path.

44. The House Committee ("HC") at its meeting on 15 May 2015 endorsed the proposal of this Panel and the Panel on Economic Development ("EDEV Panel") to appoint a subcommittee under HC to study and follow up issues relating to 3RS and agreed that the subcommittee should be placed at the top of the waiting list of subcommittees on policy issues.

Report of the Task Force on External Lighting

45. On 2 June 2015, the Administration briefed the Panel on the recommendations made by the Task Force on External Lighting ("the Task Force") and the proposed way forward to alleviate the problems caused by external lighting in Hong Kong.

46. Members noted the Task Force's observation that the community had yet to develop a consensus on the need for legislation to regulate external lighting, and its recommendation that the Government should adopt a multi-pronged approach to raise public awareness of issues concerned while bringing about changes incrementally through a package of measures, including introduction of a voluntary charter scheme to encourage owners of external lighting installations to switch off the installations after a preset time, and promotion of good practices by re-launching the Guidelines on Industry Best Practices for External Lighting Installations ("the Guidelines"). The Government proposed to adopt the measures recommended by the Task Force.

47. Members expressed diverse views on whether more rigorous measures including statutory control should be introduced to regulate external lighting. Some of them considered that, as advertisement lighting was vital to local business and tourism, it would be more appropriate to adopt voluntary measures rather than mandatory regulation to tackle external light nuisance. Some other members, however, criticized the Administration for procrastinating on legislative control over external lighting installations despite that the problem had dragged on for years. They queried the effectiveness of the charter scheme and the Guidelines, as they were non-enforceable, in driving behavioural change in the business sector, and urged the Government to expedite legislation in parallel with the proposed measures. Appreciating the complexities of issues involved, some members suggested that legislation could be taken forward starting from certain types of external lighting (e.g. non-static signs and video walls) which had caused more nuisance. In the meantime, the Administration should proactively liaise with owners of external lighting installations to solicit their co-operation in minimizing the extent of nuisance caused by the installations.

48. The Administration advised that it would monitor the impact of the multi-pronged approach by conducting a survey on external lighting two years after the implementation of the charter scheme. It would commence preparatory work to pave way for legislation in the event that the review indicated strong justifications for statutory control of external lighting installations.

Other issues

49. Other issues deliberated by the Panel included the emergency sewage bypass incident at Pillar Point Sewage Treatment Works, the initiatives relating to environmental protection in the 2015-16 Budget Speech, and the report submitted by the Delegation of the Panel which visited the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden from 2 to 8 March 2014 to study these countries' experience on thermal waste treatment facilities.

50. During the session, the Panel was also consulted on the following legislative proposal and Public Works Programme items –

- (a) Waste Disposal (Designated Waste Disposal Facility) (Amendment) Regulation 2013 and Waste Disposal (Refuse Transfer Station) (Amendment) Regulation 2013 (Commencement) Notice;
- (b) 5054DP – Further enhancing quality of coastal waters of Victoria Harbour;
- (c) 233DS – Sludge treatment facilities;
- (d) 5183DR – Refurbishment and upgrading of Sha Tin transfer station; and
- (e) four sewerage projects, namely, 272DS – Port Shelter sewerage, stage 2, 408DS – Yuen Long effluent polishing plant, 223DS – Yuen Long and Kam Tin sewage treatment upgrade – upgrading of San Wai sewage treatment works, and 235DS – Yuen Long and Kam Tin sewerage and sewage disposal.

Meetings held

51. From 9 October 2014 to mid June 2015, the Panel held a total of 11 meetings, including one joint meeting with EDEV Panel and a full-day meeting to receive views from 92 deputations/individuals on the environmental impacts of the 3RS project. The Panel has scheduled two meetings for 22 June and 21 July 2015.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
16 June 2015

Legislative Council

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Terms of Reference

1. To monitor and examine Government policies and issues of public concern relating to environmental matters (including those on energy), conservation and sustainable development.
2. To provide a forum for the exchange and dissemination of views on the above policy matters.
3. To receive briefings and to formulate views on any major legislative or financial proposals in respect of the above policy areas prior to their formal introduction to the Council or Finance Committee.
4. To monitor and examine, to the extent it considers necessary, the above policy matters referred to it by a member of the Panel or by the House Committee.
5. To make reports to the Council or to the House Committee as required by the Rules of Procedure.

**Legislative Council
Panel on Environmental Affairs**

Membership list for 2014-2015 session

Chairman Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP

Deputy Chairman Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok

Members

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 Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai (up to 21 January 2015)
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
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

(Total : 24 Members)

Clerk Ms Angel SHEK

Legal Adviser Miss Evelyn LEE