立法會 Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC61/15-16

(These minutes have been seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(5)B

Public Works Subcommittee of the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

Minutes of the 5th meeting held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex on Tuesday, 1 December 2015, at 8:30 am

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman) Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP (Deputy Chairman) Hon Albert HO Chun-yan Hon LEE Cheuk-yan Hon James TO Kun-sun Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip Hon Claudia MO Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS

Hon WU Chi-wai, MH Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP Hon CHAN Chi-chuen Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP Hon IP Kin-yuen Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Member attending:

Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP

Members absent:

Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP Hon KWOK Wai-keung Hon Dennis KWOK Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP

Public officers attending:

Mr YEUNG Tak-keung, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)3
Mr CHAN Chi-ming, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works)2

Mr Thomas Chung-ching, JP	CHAN	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)1
Ms Anissa WONG, JP		Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Ms Jasmine CHOI Suet-yung		Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr José YAM Ho-sar	1	Commissioner for Heritage Development Bureau
Mr Ricky WONG Ch	i-pan	Chief Assistant Secretary (Works)2 Development Bureau
Mr Andrew NAM Siu	1-wai	Senior Architect (Heritage) Architectural Services Department
Mr Kenneth TAM Si-wai		Chief Heritage Manager (Antiquities and Monuments) Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Mr YAU Shing-mu, J	P	Under Secretary for Transport and Housing
Wir 1710 Dining mu, J	1	Under Secretary for Transport and Housing
Ms Rebecca PUN ' JP		Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)1
Ms Rebecca PUN	Ting-ting,	Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing
Ms Rebecca PUN ' JP	Ting-ting, i-kei	Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)1 Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport
Ms Rebecca PUN ' JP Ms Judy CHUNG Su	Ting-ting, i-kei ung, JP	Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)1 Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport)5

Attendance by invitation:

Ms Christy YAU

Ms Haley CHEUNG

Ms May CHAN Suk-mei	Vice-Chairman Hong Kong News-Expo Limited
Dr Clement SO	Director Hong Kong News-Expo Limited
Mr Ronald CHIU	Committee Member Hong Kong News-Expo Limited
Ms CHAN Siu-ping	Chief Executive Officer Hong Kong News-Expo Limited
Professor Bernard V LIM	Principal Architecture Design and Research Group Limited
Clerk in attendance:	
Ms Sharon CHUNG	Chief Council Secretary (1)2
Staff in attendance:	
Ms Anita SIT	Assistant Secretary General 1
Mr Fred PANG	Senior Council Secretary (1)2
Mr Raymond CHOW	Senior Council Secretary (1)6
Ms Maggie LAU	Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Christina SHIU	Legislative Assistant (1)2

Legislative Assistant (1)7 Legislative Assistant (1)9

<u>Action</u> <u>The Chairman</u> advised that there were two funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting. One of the proposals was an agenda item carried over from the previous meeting held on 25 November 2015. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the item. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

Head 708 – Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment PWSC(2015-16)47 18QW Revitalisation Scheme – Revitalisation of the Bridges Street Market into Hong Kong News-Expo

2. <u>The Chairman</u> said that the proposal, i.e. PWSC(2015-16)47, was to upgrade 18QW to Category A at an estimated cost of \$85.3 million in money-of-the-day ("MOD") prices for the selected non-profit-making organization, the Journalism Education Foundation Hong Kong Limited, to carry out the works to convert the Bridges Street Market ("BSM") into an education and visitor centre to be named as "Hong Kong News-Expo" ("HKNE"). The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the proposal at the last meeting on 25 November 2015.

Maintenance costs for the revitalized Bridges Street Market

3. <u>Mr WONG Kwok-kin</u> said that the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions supported the revitalization project. He noted that the Journalism Education Foundation Hong Kong Limited had set up a special-purpose company ("SPC") named Hong Kong News-Expo Limited ("HKNE Ltd.") for the implementation as well as the future day-to-day operation of the project. Given that HKNE Ltd., which was to be operated on a self-finance basis, would have to bear the recurrent expenditures on the repair and maintenance of the revitalized BSM, <u>Mr WONG</u> expressed concern on whether the company would have enough revenue from the operation of HKNE to cover the expenses.

4. Considering that the maintenance costs for the revitalized BSM would be substantial, <u>Mr LEE Cheuk-yan</u>, <u>Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung</u> and <u>Mr Albert CHAN</u> asked if the Administration would provide financial support to HKNE Ltd. to lessen its financial burden arising from the preservation of the historic building.

5. <u>Commissioner for Heritage, Development Bureau</u> ("C for H/DEVB") explained that the arrangements for maintenance of the revitalized BSM were consistent with those for other projects under the Revitalizing Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme ("the Revitalization Scheme"). According to the Guide to Application of the Revitalization Scheme, the Administration would be responsible for the repair and maintenance of the structural elements of the historic buildings as well as undisturbed slopes and/or undisturbed retaining walls within the sites. Other than these, the SPCs should be responsible for the repair and maintenance of all buildings and facilities within the sites. As the Administration would bear the costs for the restoration works of BSM, it was unlikely that major maintenance problems would arise during the first few years of the operation of HKNE. Moreover, the Antiquities and Monuments Office would provide technical advice on matters related to the repair and maintenance of the historic building, where necessary, upon the completion of the revitalization works. It was estimated that the average annual maintenance costs for the revitalized BSM to be borne by HKNE Ltd. would be about \$386,000 (at September 2014 price level). Where justified, the Administration would provide a one-off grant, at a ceiling of \$5 million, to meet the starting costs and/or operating deficits of HKNE (if any) in the first two years of its operation.

In response to Mr WONG Kwok-kin's enquiry on whether the 6. Administration would subsidize the maintenance costs for the revitalized building in the third year of operation if the project ran a deficit, advised that, during process of C for H/DEVB the selecting a non-profit-making organization for each revitalization project, the Administration, upon the advice of the Advisory Committee on Revitalization of Historic Buildings ("the Advisory Committee"), which comprised experts from various fields, including historical research, architecture, surveying, social enterprise, finance, etc., had duly assessed the financial viability of each proposal.

7. <u>Mr CHAN Chi-chuen</u> held the view that the Administration should adjust the ceiling of the one-off grant as necessary and on a case-by-case basis to meet the financial needs of each revitalization project. <u>C for H/DEVB</u> responded that the same arrangements for financial support, i.e. to offer a one-off grant at a ceiling of \$5 million to meet the starting costs and/or operating deficits of the SPC concerned in the first two years of operation, which were set out in the Guide to Application of the Revitalization Scheme, were adopted for all projects under the Scheme. It would be unfair to the unsuccessful applicants under the Revitalization Scheme if preferential treatment was given to HKNE Ltd. for the maintenance of the revitalized BSM after the project was awarded.

8. <u>Mr CHAN Chi-chuen</u> further asked whether the Administration would bear the maintenance costs for the new lift to be installed at HKNE, given that the maintenance of a lift would incur higher costs as compared to other facilities. <u>C for H/DEVB</u> reiterated that the Administration, upon the advice of the Advisory Committee, had considered whether the selected project could be financially sustainable in the long run when assessing the applications for the revitalization project. 9. <u>Dr KWOK Ka-ki</u> opined that the public access facilities to be provided in HKNE, such as a new link bridge with a lift, would bring convenience to the elderly, persons with disabilities and the general public who lived or worked in the vicinity. Similar to maintaining the barrier-free facilities provided under the Universal Accessibility Programme, the Administration should bear the maintenance costs for such facilities in HKNE. He requested the Administration to provide information, before the submission of funding proposal to the relevant meeting of the Finance Committee ("FC"), on whether the recurrent costs for the maintenance of the new lift would be borne or subsidized by the Administration upon the completion of the conversion works.

(*Post-meeting note:* The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide <u>LC Paper No. PWSC52/15-16(01)</u> on 14 December 2015.)

Sustainable operation of the Hong Kong News-Expo

10. <u>Mr Albert CHAN</u> said he supported the revitalization project but was worried about its financial sustainability. He asked whether HKNE Ltd. would consider providing hostel places at HKNE for rent as a source of revenue. <u>Ms May CHAN Suk-mei, Vice-Chairman, HKNE Ltd.</u> ("Vice-Chairman/HKNE Ltd.") said that due to space constraints, only media education facilities would be provided at HKNE.

11. <u>Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung</u> enquired about the sources of revenue of HKNE <u>Vice-Chairman/HKNE Ltd.</u> advised that the estimated annual revenue was around \$6 million, with a breakdown as follows: (a) \$2.5 million from the sponsorship of The Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust ("the Jockey Club") for conducting media education programmes, (b) \$2 million from operating guided tours (which covered HKNE and other heritage sites in the district) and interactive games at the experiential studios at HKNE, (c) \$0.23 million from the organization of media education lectures/seminars, (d) \$0.2 million from operating school outreach programmes, (e) \$0.24 million from sale of books and souvenirs, and (f) \$0.8 million from donation.

12. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's further enquiry, In response to Vice-Chairman/HKNE Ltd. explained that the Jockey Club would sponsor each participating student of HKNE's media education programmes with \$50. It was expected that there would be some 50 000 students participating in the programmes each year. Therefore, the total annual sponsorship from the Jockey Club was estimated to be \$2.5 million. The facilities at HKNE would be made available for hire during the evening hours and public

holidays to generate revenue.

13. <u>Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung</u> was concerned that the amount of donation received by HKNE Ltd. would fluctuate. Furthermore, the sponsorship from the Jockey Club and the revenue from the interactive games at the experiential studios would vary with the number of visitors to HKNE. He considered that the income for HKNE would be unstable and suggested that HKNE Ltd. should explore other sources of income to support the operation of HKNE.

14. <u>Vice-Chairman/HKNE Ltd.</u> replied she was confident that the media education programmes run by HKNE would attract a large number of students. Moreover, HKNE Ltd. would coordinate with travel agencies and operators of other heritage sites in the district for organizing cultural and heritage tours. The half-day guided tours would attract both local and overseas visitors as well as generate revenue.

15. In response to Mr Albert CHAN's enquiry, <u>Vice-Chairman/HKNE Ltd.</u> advised that HKNE would be operating in deficit in the first two years. However, it was expected that a financial balance would be achieved in the third year.

16. <u>Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung</u> said that the purpose of HKNE was consistent with the core values of Hong Kong, i.e. upholding press freedom, the Administration should therefore support the operation of HKNE by, say, offering a longer tenancy period to HKNE Ltd., so that it could plan its operation on a long-term basis. <u>Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung</u> and <u>Mr Albert CHAN</u> requested the Administration to provide information on the action that it would take to ensure the financial sustainability of HKNE so that its operation would not be terminated upon the completion of the three-year tenancy agreement.

(*Post-meeting note:* The Administration's supplementary information was circulated to members vide <u>LC Paper No. PWSC52/15-16(01)</u> on 14 December 2015.)

Exhibits at the Hong Kong News-Expo

17. <u>Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung</u> enquired whether exhibitions on the incidents related to oppression of press freedom would be staged at HKNE. <u>Vice-Chairman/HKNE Ltd.</u> replied that HKNE would showcase the development of Hong Kong since the 1840s through displaying important news reports at different times. Themed exhibitions on the pillars of Hong Kong's success, such as the rule of law and freedom of the press, would be

organized periodically.

Barrier-free transport services for visitors

18. <u>Mr CHAN Chi-chuen</u> said there were concerns that it would be difficult for wheelchair users and people with disabilities to travel to HKNE as there was no wheelchair-accessible public bus serving the area. <u>C for H/DEVB</u> advised that wheelchair users could access HKNE via PMQ (a revitalized historic building on Hollywood Road), which provided barrier-free access between Hollywood Road and Bridges Street.

Other views

19. <u>Mr SIN Chung-kai</u> welcomed the implementation of the revitalization project, which, in his view, would provide an opportunity for the public to better understand the functions of the media. He called on the Administration to provide greater support for HKNE's media education activities.

Voting on PWSC(2015-16)47

20. There being no further questions from members on the item, <u>the</u> <u>Chairman</u> put the proposal to vote. At the request of Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, <u>the Chairman</u> ordered a division. Twenty-three members voted for, no one voted against the proposal and no one abstained. The votes of individual members were as follows --

For: Mr Albert HO Mr CHAN Kam-lam Mr TAM Yiu-chung Mr WONG Ting-kwong Mr Alan LEONG Mr Albert CHAN Mr Charles Peter MOK Dr Elizabeth QUAT Mr Tony TSE (23 members)

Mr LEE Cheuk-yan Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung Mr Andrew LEUNG Mr WONG Kwok-kin Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung Mr Steven HO Mr CHAN Chi-chuen Ms CHAN Yuen-han Dr KWOK Ka-ki Mr SIN Chung-kai Mr Christopher CHUNG *Against:* (0 member)

Abstain: (0 member)

21. <u>The Chairman</u> declared that the proposal was endorsed by the Subcommittee.

22. <u>Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung</u> requested that this item, i.e. PWSC(2015-16)47, be voted on separately at the relevant FC meeting.

Head 706 – Highways PWSC(2015-16)14 845TH Hong Kong–Zhuhai–Macao Bridge Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities–Reclamation and Superstructures

23. <u>The Chairman</u> advised that the proposal was to increase the approved project estimate ("APE") of 845TH by \$5,461.1 million from \$30,433.9 million to \$35,895.0 million in MOD prices to cover the cost of the works under the project. The Panel on Transport had been consulted on the proposal on 16 January 2015. Panel members supported in principle the submission of the proposal to the Subcommittee for consideration. Pursuant to Panel members' requests, the Administration had provided supplementary information on the proposal vide LC Paper No. CB(4)628/14-15(01) on 11 March 2015. A report on the gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

24. <u>The Chairman</u> further advised that the proposal had been discussed at the meetings of the Subcommittee on 3 and 9 June 2015 but the discussion was adjourned on 9 June 2015 after a motion to adjourn the discussion on the item was carried. The Administration had provided supplementary information about the item to the Subcommittee. The relevant paper, LC Paper No. PWSC231/14-15(01), had been issued to members on 29 June 2015. The Administration had subsequently re-submitted the item to the Subcommittee for discussion at the meeting on 30 June 2015. Due to time constraints, the Subcommittee had not been able to examine the proposal in the 2014-2015 legislative session. The proposal was then put on the agenda for the present meeting for the Subcommittee's consideration.

25. At the invitation of the Chairman, <u>Under Secretary for Transport and</u> <u>Housing</u> ("USTH") briefed members on the justifications for increasing the APE of 845TH. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, <u>Director of Highways</u> ("DHy") elaborated on the reclamation works for the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB") Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities ("HKBCF") artificial island and the consequences of failing to have the approval of the FC for the requested increase in the APE within a short period of time.

(*Post-meeting note*: A soft copy of the powerpoint presentation materials (Chinese version) was circulated to members vide <u>LC Paper</u> <u>No. PWSC35/15-16(01)</u> by email on 1 December 2015. The English version was circulated on 7 December 2015.)

Project cost and progress of the construction works

26. In response to Mr Andrew LEUNG's enquiry on why the Administration was seeking additional funding for the project in a rushed manner, <u>USTH</u> explained that in view of the time-limited nature of the works contracts and the delay caused by the passage of an adjournment motion on the item by the Subcommittee in June 2015, the Administration was under a tight schedule to secure additional funds to complete the HZMB HKBCF project.

27. <u>Dr KWOK Ka-ki</u> considered that the reasons given by the Administration for increasing the APE of the HKBCF project and for the delay in the HZMB local projects, such as unstable supply of materials, restriction in airport height, constraints in environment protection requirement and slower-than-expected consolidation performance of reclamation works, were unconvincing, as the Administration should have already foreseen these factors at the planning stage of the project. In his view, LegCo was being forced to inject public money into the HZMB local projects to ensure their completion in spite of the huge cost overrun, and HZMB would eventually become a "white elephant" project if the demand for the facility turned out to be small.

28. <u>Mr Tony TSE</u> also considered that the reasons given by the Administration for the cost overrun and the delay in the works of 845TH were unconvincing. He pointed out that, with reference to the information given in Enclosure 5 to the discussion paper PWSC(2015-16)14, the actual reclamation cost was in fact lower than that in the original APE. He opined that, given the recurrence of cost overrun and delay in a number of major public works projects in recent years, the public would lose confidence in the Administration's ability in managing such projects.

29. <u>DHy</u> explained that the cost overrun and delay in the HZMB local projects were due to the following reasons --

- (a) The sand for construction was under protection in the Mainland. The works contractors had to comply with stringent requirements of the Mainland authorities when extracting the sand and exporting it to Hong Kong.
- (b) Given the height restriction in the vicinity of the airport, large equipment used in constructing steel cellular seawalls could not access some of the seawall locations which were close to the airport until the height restriction was lifted during the temporary closures of one of the runways. Therefore, the construction schedule for part of the steel cellular seawalls had to tie in with the timetable of the closures of the south runway. The Administration had been aware of this constraint before the commencement of the reclamation works, but the timetable of runway closures had been changed in the course of the reclamation works, thereby interrupting the relevant construction works.
- (c) The Environmental Permits had imposed stringent conditions on the HZMB local projects, making it difficult for the contractors to accelerate the projects through the arrangements of overtime work and increases in labour and plant resources.

Referring to the recent agreement between the Administration and the 30. MTR Corporation Limited on imposing a cap on the cost overrun amount of construction Hong project of the Kong section of the the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link ("the XRL project"), Mr Christopher CHEUNG asked if the Administration would consider introducing similar arrangements for 845TH to avoid further increases in the APE in the future. Miss CHAN Yuen-han sought confirmation from the Administration that no further increase in the APE of 845TH would be required apart from the proposed amount of \$5,461.1 million.

31. <u>USTH</u> replied that the management approach for the HZMB local projects was different from that for the XRL project, i.e. the Highways Department ("HyD") was directly responsible for overseeing the implementation of the HZMB local projects, whereas the MTR Corporation Limited was entrusted by the Administration to implement the XRL project. Similar to the arrangements for other public works projects, the Administration had to seek extra funding from FC to cover additional costs for 845TH arising from unforeseen circumstances. <u>USTH</u> further explained

Action

that having regard to the progress of the works contracts under 845TH, the Administration considered that no further increase in the APE, other than the amount sought at present, would be required for the project.

32. <u>Miss CHAN Yuen-han</u> expressed concern that the HZMB local projects might not be completed by end-2017 in spite of the postponement of the expected completion date from end-2016, and the delay in the local projects would affect the commissioning of the entire HZMB project. <u>Mr</u> <u>Tony TSE</u> expressed a similar concern and asked about the progress of the HZMB project in Zhuhai and Macao.

33. <u>USTH</u> advised that the revised completion date, i.e. end-2017, was based on the results of an in-depth and objective assessment by HyD. Moreover, the HZMB Main Bridge project and the related projects of the Mainland and Macao sides also encountered many unforeseen difficulties, making it very difficult to complete and commission the entire HZMB by end-2016. An assessment on the progress of the projects concerned was underway and the Joint Works Committee of the Three Governments ("JWC") would collectively propose a forecast commissioning date of the entire HZMB project afterwards.

34. <u>Mr Tony TSE</u> enquired, given that the HZMB local projects had been delayed by a judicial review ("JR") case regarding the Environmental Impact Assessment report on the projects in 2010, whether the Administration had adjusted the works schedule and construction cost earlier on. <u>DHy</u> explained that while the said projects had been deferred by one year due to the JR case, the Administration had originally intended to catch up with the works schedule through the arrangements of overtime work, an increase in labour and plant resources, etc.

Dissemination of information about the revised completion date for the local projects

35. Referring to the Administration's issuance of a press release in the late night on 25 November 2015 about the delay in the completion of the HZMB Main Bridge and related local projects, <u>Dr KWOK Ka-ki</u> questioned whether the Administration had intended to evade media enquiries over such an important issue. He also asked why the Acting Secretary for Transport and Housing had not informed LegCo Members about the revised completion schedule when he attended a Council meeting on 25 November to answer an oral question raised by a Member on the HZMB project.

36. <u>USTH</u> said it was stated in paragraph 6 of the discussion paper PWSC(2015-16)14 that the HZMB local projects might not be completed in

time by end-2016 and HyD was reviewing the anticipated completion date. As regards the progress of the HZMB Main Bridge project, a preliminary assessment had been completed and the results were discussed at the JWC meeting in September 2015. It was agreed at the meeting that an in-depth assessment of the works progress would be required. The Administration had originally intended to brief the Subcommittee on the revised completion schedule for the local projects at the meeting on 1 December 2015. However, in order to quell a rumour circulating in the evening of 25 November 2015 about a long delay in the HZMB project, the Administration had decided to issue a news statement on 25 November 2015. <u>USTH</u> further advised that the oral question raised by a Member on 25 November 2015 was related to the impact of the HZMB project on the fisheries industry, but not about the works progress of the project.

37. In reply to Mr Tony TSE's enquiry on whether there was any update on the status of the various works contracts under 845TH as per Enclosure 2 to the discussion paper PWSC(2015-16)14 since the paper had been released in May 2015, <u>DHy</u> advised that out of the 10 works contracts under the project, eight of them had been awarded and the relevant works were in progress, whereas the tendering exercises for the remaining two contracts were underway.

38. <u>Mr Tony TSE</u> expressed disappointment over the Administration's inaction to update the information in the discussion paper about the status of the contracts under the project. The Administration undertook to provide updates on the status and progress of the various works contracts.

(*Post-meeting note:* The Chinese version of the Administration's supplementary information paper was circulated to members vide <u>LC Paper No. PWSC41/15-16(01)</u> on 8 December 2015. The English version was circulated on 9 December.)

<u>Consequences of failing to obtain approval for the requested increase in the approved project estimate</u>

39. <u>Mr LEE Cheuk-yan</u> enquired about the impacts on the functioning of HKBCF and the users of these facilities, in particular the additional waiting time for these users, if FC rejected the Administration's proposal to increase the APE. He also asked about the contingency measures to be taken by the Administration to mitigate such impacts. <u>The Chairman</u> asked if the construction of the viaducts and vehicular underpasses in HKBCF would be affected if the funding proposal was negatived.

40. <u>DHy</u> advised that without the additional funding, only minimum facilities would be available to barely meet the operational needs of HKBCF only during the initial commissioning stage, which would be very undesirable to the operation of HKBCF. In addition, without the additional funding, the Administration would not be able to cope with any new risks.

Settlement and lateral movements of the reclaimed land

41. <u>Mr Andrew LEUNG</u> sought information about the impact of the settlement and lateral movements of the HKBCF artificial island on the development of the HKBCF superstructures and facilities. <u>Miss CHAN</u> <u>Yuen-han</u> expressed concern on the structural safety of the HKBCF artificial island in the light of the lateral movements of the reclaimed land.

42. <u>DHy</u> replied that it was normal for settlement of reclaimed land and lateral movements of seawalls to occur during the construction period. According to the assessment of HyD's consultant, the HKBCF artificial island was structurally safe. Moreover, the construction of the superstructures of HKBCF would start only when the settlement of the reclaimed land was stable.

43. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:29 am.

Council Business Division 1 Legislative Council Secretariat 18 December 2015