

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1029/03-04
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

**Minutes of meeting held on
Thursday, 29 January 2004, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Hon CHOY So-yuk (Chairman)
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan (Deputy Chairman)
Dr Hon David CHU Yu-lin, JP
Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Dr Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP
Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS, JP
Dr Hon LO Wing-lok, JP
Hon LAU Ping-cheung
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

**Public officers
attending** : **For item IV**

Environment, Transport and Works Bureau

Ms Doris CHEUNG
Deputy Secretary (Environment and Transport)E1

Miss Winnie HO
Principal Assistant Secretary (Environment and Transport)E2

Environmental Protection Department

Dr Ellen CHAN
Assistant Director (Waste Facilities)

Action

For Item V

Environment, Transport and Works Bureau

Mr Thomas CHOW
Deputy Secretary (Environment and Transport)E2

Ms Jessie WONG
Principal Assistant Secretary (Environment and Transport)E4

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Dr WONG Fook-yee
Assistant Director (Country and Marine Parks)

Mr Edward WONG Cheuk-kee
Senior Marine Parks Officer

Clerk in attendance : Miss Becky YU
Chief Council Secretary (1)1

Staff in attendance : Mrs Mary TANG
Senior Council Secretary (1)2

Miss Mandy POON
Legislative Assistant 4

I. Confirmation of minutes

- (LC Paper No. CB(1) 811/03-04 — Minutes of the joint meeting with the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works held on 8 December 2003
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 820/03-04 — Minutes of the joint meeting with the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works held on 27 November 2003
- LC Paper No. CB(1) 844/03-04 — Minutes of the meeting held on 22 December 2003)

The minutes of the joint meetings with the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works held on 27 November and 8 December 2003 and that of the regular meeting held on 22 December 2003 were confirmed.

Action

II. Information paper issued since last meeting

2. Members noted that no information paper had been issued since last meeting.

III. Items for discussion at the next meeting

- (LC Paper No. CB(1) 846/03-04(01) — List of follow-up actions
LC Paper No. CB(1) 846/03-04(02) — List of outstanding items for discussion)

3. In view of the recent incidents involving illegal excavation at Tung Chung river and spraying of concrete at two streams in Sai Kung, members were concerned about the lack of co-ordination among various government departments in planning and monitoring construction works on natural rivers. They agreed to hold a joint meeting with the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works to discuss the impact of construction works on rivers in Hong Kong on Monday, 23 February 2004, at 2:30 pm. The regular meeting of the Panel would be held immediately after the joint meeting at 3:30 pm to discuss the measures to promote prevention and recovery of municipal solid waste in Hong Kong.

IV. PWP Item 162 DR - Restoration of Five Urban Landfills - post-completion environmental monitoring work

- (LC Paper No. PWSC30/03-04 — Supplementary information on
(issued on 5 January 2004) 5161DR — Restoration of Shuen Wan Landfill - post-completion environmental monitoring work provided by the Administration
LC Paper No. CB(1) 846/03-04(03) — Paper provided by the Administration)

4. The Deputy Secretary of the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment and Transport)E1(DSETW(ET)E1) briefed members on the Administration's proposal to upgrade the public works project item 5162DR "Restoration of Five Urban Landfills – post-completion environmental monitoring work" to Category A. The proposal which involved the continuation of the post-completion environmental monitoring work at the five urban landfills for a further period of seven years (from May 2005 to May 2012) at an estimated cost of \$79.1 million in money-of-the-day prices would be submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) in February 2004.

5. Noting that the amount of landfill gas and pollution level of leachate generated in the five landfills had considerably reduced, the Chairman held the view that there might be room for further reduction in cost of the environmental monitoring work. DSETW(ET)E1 advised that the project cost of \$79 million for the second seven years had taken into account the reduction in volume of landfill gas and leachate but the amount of monitoring work involved was still substantial. Moreover, the cost had

Action

Admin

been much reduced as compared to that of \$147 million for the first seven years. She nevertheless agreed to work with the landfill operators to see if there was room for further reduction. To facilitate members' understanding on the high recurrent cost for the post-completion environmental monitoring of restored landfills, the Administration was requested to provide an estimate on the total cost incurred for restoration and environmental monitoring of all restored landfills in Hong Kong, based on the assumption that the required work would need to last for a period of 30 years.

6. Ms Cyd HO noted with concern that the average content levels of methane in the landfill gas and that of nitrogen in the leachate of the five landfills were still far beyond the acceptable levels of 1% and 200 milligram per litre respectively. She asked how long the post-completion environmental monitoring work would take before the content levels of methane and nitrogen could reach the acceptable levels. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Facilities) (ADEP(WF)) agreed that the current methane content of 16% to 44% in landfill gas was not desirable as explosion might take place if there was a concentration of 5% to 15% of methane in the air. As such, constant monitoring was necessary. She however pointed out that it was not possible to give a realistic estimate on when the methane content would be reduced to the acceptable level as it might not decrease proportionately with time. By way of illustration, the methane content of Jordan Valley Landfill was 55% in 1998 as compared to 44% in 2003 while the methane content of the much older Ngau Chi Wan Landfill was 20% in 1998 as compared to 16% in 2003. Methane generated from urban landfills had to be carefully treated to ensure safety as these landfills were in close proximity to the densely populated areas of Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong. Nitrogen in the leachate also had to be properly treated before discharging into the sewage system. Hence, there was a need to continue with the environmental review once every five years to ascertain whether the landfill sites had been completely restored and whether further monitoring work was required. As the need to handle and dispose of waste would hinge on the measures to promote prevention and recovery of waste which would be discussed at the next regular meeting on 23 February 2004, Ms Cyd HO requested the Administration to include in the discussion paper the cost incurred for waste reduction and recovery, waste handling and disposal, as well as the restoration and post-completion environmental monitoring work for the restored landfills.

7. Ms Emily LAU reiterated that consideration should be given to putting the restored landfill sites into beneficial uses such as space for the much needed recreational facilities. Referring to the Administration's paper referenced PWSCI(2003-04) which set out the details of the planned afteruse of the restored landfills and their current development status and constraints, DSETW(ET)E1 said that while the Administration was aware of the need for recreational space, care had to be taken to ensure that the landfill site was safe for use, and that its planned usage would not conflict with the environmental monitoring work being undertaken. Presently, Ngau Chi Wan Landfill and Ma Yau Tong West Landfill were planned to be developed into rest parks while Ma Yau Tong Central Landfill would be developed into an extension of the Lam Tin Park and Jordan Valley Landfill would be developed into an ecological theme park with an environmental education centre and two gateball pitches. Meanwhile, Sai Tso Wan Landfill would be developed into a multi-purpose grass pitch

Action

for football and baseball and was planned to be opened in mid-2004.

8. Given that the five urban landfills were closed between late 1977 and early 1990, Ms LAU queried why these landfill sites were not put to more beneficial uses earlier. She then enquired about the closure dates of individual landfills. DSETW(ET)E1 advised that the Ngau Chi Wan Landfill was closed in 1977, Sai Tso Wan Landfill in 1980, Ma Yau Tong West Landfill in 1981, Ma Yau Tong Central Landfill in 1986, and Jordan Valley in 1990. While the five urban landfills were closed at different times, a joint funding application for restoration of these landfills was only submitted in 1995. ADEP(WF) supplemented that there was no leachate or landfill gas management system in some old landfills. Upon the establishment of the Environmental Protection Department in 1986, it became apparent that restoration and environmental monitoring for landfills were necessary. Since then, 12 of the 13 landfills had been restored. The restoration works for the remaining landfill at Pillar Point Valley was expected to commence by end of the year. Meanwhile, environmental monitoring was being conducted on the three operating landfills.

9. Noting that the project priority of the planned usage of Ma Yau Tong West Landfill, Ma Yau Tong Central Landfill and Jordan Valley was still under review, Ms LAU was concerned that it would be a long time before these landfill space could be made available for public use. DSETW(ET)E1 advised that planned usage of these three landfills were under the purview of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD). Owing to the tight budget, there might be a need for LCSD to review and prioritize its projects. Ms LAU stressed the need for early restoration of closed landfills as this would not only resolve the environmental problems but also make available space for more beneficial uses. She also requested that the outcome of the review by LCSD together with the costs for providing the planned facilities be included in the Administration's submission to PWSC.

Admin

10. The Chairman opined that one of the reasons for not utilizing the closed landfill space earlier might be due the concern about the presence of methane which was a threat to public safety. Mr WONG Yung-kan agreed that public safety was of utmost importance in considering the use of landfill sites. He then enquired about the other possible uses of landfill sites apart from recreational purposes. ADEP(WF) affirmed that care had to be taken to ensure that there would not be any safety hazard to the public before allocating the landfill sites to LCSD for development into recreational facilities. Environmental monitoring work, including control on emission of methane, would continue to be carried out in the restored landfills. She further pointed out that of the total 44 hectares of land from the five urban landfills, only about 13 hectares were levelled ground which could be put to beneficial use. The rest was slopes which could not be of much use for development. On other possible uses of landfill sites, ADEP(WF) advised that consideration had been given to allocating spaces in stages 2 and 3 of the Tseung Kwan O Landfill as playgrounds for flying model airplanes. However, usage which was in conflict with the environmental monitoring work, such as barbecue pit using open fire, would not be considered for safety reason. She also took note of the Chairman's suggestion of planting trees along the slopes of restored landfills with a view to improving the aesthetics of landfill sites and providing more green space.

Action

11. To ensure safety, Mr Henry WU opined that warning signs should be posted at the landfill sites to alert the public on any possible hazard. He also asked whether part of the funding for restoration works could be earmarked for devising a sensor system such that the levels of pollutants, if exceeding the acceptable standards, would be detected and relayed to a central monitoring system overseeing all the five urban landfills. ADEP(WF) agreed that warning signs would be installed as appropriate. She however pointed out that landfill sites which could be opened for public use would not pose any safety hazard as evidenced in the case of the golf driving range in Shuen Wan Landfill. As regards funding for the restoration works, ADEP(WF) advised this was mainly to provide for landfill gas and leachate management systems as well as slope stability works. It might be too costly to provide for a central monitoring system for the five urban landfills. At present, monitoring work for the closed landfills was carried out on a regular basis and care was taken to prevent gas escaping from the landfills to the neighbouring areas. Given the advancement in technology, Mr Henry WU pointed out that it might be more cost effective in the long term to implement a mechanized monitoring system to replace the existing manual monitoring system. ADEP(WF) agreed to consult the landfill operators on the technical feasibility of introducing such a central monitoring mechanism.

12. The Chairman enquired if proper use had been made of the methane generated from the five urban landfills which were conveniently located rendering connection to gas companies much easier. DSETW(ET)E1 advised that whether the landfill gas could be put to beneficial use would hinge on its methane content. Landfill gas with less than 35% methane content had no utilisation value. Also, the cost-effectiveness of using landfill gas was dependent on the amount of gas produced and proximity of the landfill to the utility network. By way of illustration, the cleansed landfill gas generated from Shuen Wan Landfill had been conveyed to the gas station of the China Light and Gas Company at the Tai Po Industrial Estate for use as replacement fuel. Apart from Jordan Valley Landfill where the landfill gas with methane content of over 35% had been used on-site for its leachate management system, the landfill gas generated from the remaining four landfills, which was limited in volume with low methane content, was either vented or flared.

V. Management of Marine Parks

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 846/03-04(04) — Summary of deputations' views on the management of marine parks

LC Paper No. CB(1) 846/03-04(05) — Paper provided by the Administration)

13. The Deputy Secretary of the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment and Transport)E2 (DSETW(ET)E2) briefed members on the progress made to further improve the management of marine parks since the subject was last discussed at the Panel meeting on 22 July 2003.

Action

Enforcement against unauthorized fishing

14. Mr Martin LEE sought clarification on the enhanced strategy to step up efforts in curbing unauthorized fishing activities of Mainland vessels in marine parks. DSETW(ET)E2 explained that according to past practice, any Mainland vessels intercepted in marine parks by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), for carrying out illegal fishing activities, would be handed over to the Marine Police. They would usually be escorted out of Hong Kong waters. To increase the deterrent effect, the Marine Police had agreed to arrest the Mainland crew on board Mainland fishing vessels intercepted in marine parks and handle them as “unauthorized entrants” where circumstances warranted. They would be repatriated back to the Mainland while their fishing vessels would be detained and handed over to the Mainland authorities for their appropriate action. Where Mainland vessels were caught conducting illegal activities in contravention of the Marine Parks Ordinance (Cap.476) (MPO), prosecution action would be taken by AFCD against the Mainland fishermen concerned. Parallel action would also be taken against them by the Marine Police for unauthorized entry into Hong Kong and their vessels would be detained and handed over to the Mainland authorities. The Assistant Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (Country and Marine Parks) (AD/AFCD) added that the enhanced enforcement action against illegal activities under MPO would be implemented soon after AFCD had worked out the detailed arrangements with the departments concerned.

15. Mr LEE however pointed out that the way in which the Administration’s paper was prepared seemed to imply that the enhanced enforcement action had already carried out. DSETW(ET)E2 clarified that while the enhanced enforcement involving prosecution action taken by AFCD had yet to be implemented pending finalization of details, enforcement action in other areas had been stepped up by AFCD to protect the marine parks. Mr LEE said that in future, the Administration should make it clear in its paper to the Panel the actions which had been completed and those which were still under planning.

16. Instead of handing those Mainland fisherman who were caught fishing illegally in Hong Kong to the Mainland authorities for action, the Chairman queried why prosecution according to the laws in Hong Kong was not instituted against these fishermen. Mr Martin LEE agreed that this would achieve a greater deterrent effect. AD/AFCD said that AFCD was working with the departments concerned including the Marine Police on the detailed arrangement for taking prosecution actions against the Mainland crew concerned. While it was not the Administration’s intention to detain Mainland fishing vessels trespassing Hong Kong waters for a long time, action would be taken against the Mainland fishermen if they were caught fishing illegally in Hong Kong or engaged in any activities contravening MPO as soon as possible.

17. Ms Emily LAU opined that there should not be any differential treatment for Mainland fishermen. Where there was a need to detain the offender and his vessel awaiting prosecution, this should be done regardless whether he was a local or a Mainlander. She also considered it necessary for the Administration to step up publicity on the consequences of contravening MPO and its regulations. AD/AFCD

Action

Admin

affirmed that offenders from both the Mainland and Hong Kong would be brought to justice alike. DSETW(ET)E2 added that a Mainland fisherman who was sentenced to imprisonment for unauthorized fishing or any other offences in Hong Kong would have to serve his term before repatriation. To facilitate members' understanding, the Administration was requested to provide a paper explaining the joint enforcement actions to be taken by AFCD with the Marine Police and the Mainland authorities in combating unauthorized fishing by Mainland vessels in marine parks.

18. Mr WONG Yung-kan said that the subject of unauthorized fishing by Mainland fishermen had been repeatedly brought up for discussion over the past five years and yet no effective measures had been taken to tackle the problem. He pointed out that the crux of the problem was that Mainland fishing vessels handed over by Marine Police to the Mainland authorities were released soon after payment of fines and were allowed to re-enter Hong Kong within hours of arrest. He also expressed disappointment that Mainland fishermen caught stealing Buddha pine in Hong Kong were released by the courts. As the present enforcement actions had failed to deter unauthorized fishing, a better arrangement would be for the Hong Kong Government to confiscate these vessels, in line with the practice before the Handover. He further proposed that a working group comprising representatives from relevant Government departments and the fishing industry be established to oversee the management of marine parks. This would encourage the participation of local fishermen in the protection of marine parks.

19. In response, DSETW(ET)E2 said that any decision to release the Mainland fishermen for stealing Buddha pine in Hong Kong would have been made by the courts based on evidence. On the proposal of involving the fishing industry in the protection of the marine parks, he said that the industry was represented at the Marine Parks Committee of the Country and Marine Parks Board. He nevertheless agreed to solicit co-operation from local fishermen in the enforcement against unauthorized fishing in marine parks. AD/AFCD added that AFCD worked closely with local fishermen who would often report cases of suspected illegal activities in marine parks to AFCD for necessary actions. In fact, a number of AFCD staff were once fishermen and familiar with the fishing community. They welcomed fishermen to assist in enhancing the enforcement against illegal activities in marine parks. As regards the confiscation of fishing vessels, DSETW(ET)E2 said that he was not aware of such an arrangement before the Handover but would check with the Marine Police.

Management of marine parks

20. Ms Miriam LAU queried how enforcement was strengthened given that only 84 prosecutions, including eight cases of littering, had been made since July 2003. She enquired whether additional staff had been deployed to step up patrol duties and whether voluntary Marine Park Ambassadors were engaged on a regular basis to the marine parks. She pointed out that unlike the practice in Hong Kong where volunteers were deployed to advise visitors on the importance of protecting the natural environment, many overseas countries had park rangers to take enforcement actions against destructive acts to country and marine parks. AD/AFCD confirmed that AFCD had stepped up the protection and management of marine parks. About

Action

30 staff were deployed on day and night shifts to carry out patrol duties both along the coast and at sea. Meanwhile, volunteers were deployed to marine parks to advise visitors on the importance of protecting the natural environment. Signs had been put up along the beach and the coast to remind the public of the need to conserve the marine environment and avoid causing disturbance to the villagers. AFCD had also published a special leaflet reminding visitors to keep their voices down when passing through the village. Prosecution would be taken against breaches of MPO.

21. Ms LAU opined that for effective enforcement, it was important that the presence of park wardens should be visible to visitors, and that more proactive actions should be taken to guard against breaches of MPO. The Senior Marine Parks Officer (SMPO) advised that there were at least four to five staff on patrol duty in each shift. More staff would be deployed in the day shift during holidays to attend to the increased number of visitors. Given the size of these parks, the park wardens might not be able to be seen by every visitor. He nevertheless thanked Ms LAU for her views and agreed to see if there was room for further improvement.

22. Dr David CHU was concerned about the damages to the corals and other important forms of marine life as a result of the destructive acts of some of the visitors to the marine parks. He considered that enforcement should be strictly implemented, particularly during holidays. Sharing similar concern, Ms Emily LAU asked if the situation had since improved after implementation of the enhanced enforcement actions. Dr LAW Chi-kwong enquired about the enforcement actions taken by park wardens against visitors found to have breached MPO. DSETW(ET)E2 explained that under the Marine Parks and Marine Reserves Regulation, no person shall fish or hunt, injure, remove or take away any animal or plant by any means in or from a marine park or marine reserve and those who contravened the provisions of the Regulation would be subject to penalties. SMPO supplemented that offenders would be approached and warned by the park wardens on the commission of offence under MPO. The personal particulars of the offenders and the details of their offences would be passed on to the prosecution unit of AFCD for further action where appropriate. He added that AFCD had been closely monitoring the water quality and the conditions of corals in marine parks. The latest water quality monitoring results and Reef Check showed that the situation had remained satisfactory.

23. Mr WONG Yung-kan enquired about the recreational activities allowed within marine parks. AD/AFCD advised that while swimming, snorkeling and boating were allowed, fishing was prohibited in marine parks except for those fishermen with permits issued by AFCD. Given that a lot of people were interested in fishing for pleasure, Mr WONG asked if consideration could be given to allowing fishing in marine parks subject to certain restrictions as in the case of some overseas countries. He held the view that this could be done with proper legislative arrangements governing fishing practices in marine parks. AD/AFCD said that AFCD had taken into account the need for recreational fishing and had demarcated two sites in Tung Ping Chau Marine Park for such purpose. Besides, he supplemented that fishing was allowed outside marine parks.

Action

Improvements to the Hoi Ha Wan Marine Park

24. Referring to the letter from Friends of Hoi Ha dated 10 October 2003, Ms Emily LAU asked whether the concerns about environmental damages arising from eco-tourism had been addressed. DSETW(ET)E2 advised that improvements would be made to toilet facilities through conversion of the existing aqua privy at Hoi Ha into a toilet with flushing facilities. Meanwhile, more mobile toilets had been provided and cleaning had also been stepped up, particularly during holidays. As for traffic control, DSETW(ET)E2 said that modifications to the roundabout and construction of lay-bys had been made to improve the traffic flow at Hoi Ha. Anti-parking railings had also been erected to enhance pedestrian safety. In addition, consequent to a review of the current permit system regulating the movement of private vehicles beyond the Pak Tam Chung Barrier, AFCD had implemented a new system on 1 December 2003 under which the maximum number of permits issued to coaches destined for Hoi Ha was limited to 12 per day i.e. two-way trips by 12 coaches a day in maximum, as compared to a total of 30 coach permits per day in the past for access beyond the Pak Tam Chung Barrier with no control on destinations. The new arrangement had effectively controlled the number of visitors to Hoi Ha. In parallel, AFCD and the Police would continue to take enforcement actions against vehicles entering the Hoi Ha area without a valid permit and illegal parking at the roundabout outside Hoi Ha Village. The traffic control situation had since improved over the past months. AD/AFCD supplemented that the new permit arrangement had had the support of the Hoi Ha Village and the Sai Kung North Rural Committee. Where necessary, the issuance of the 12 coach permits could be adjusted so that six permits would be issued in the morning and six in the afternoon in an attempt to ease traffic.

25. On the concern that fewer species of marine animals were found along the Hoi Ha Wan, SMPO said that these animals might have been displaced to other areas or deeper waters as a result of the increased number of visitors. Recent studies along the side of the bay that was less frequented by visitors indicated that there was still a wide variety of marine animals. He added that in collaboration with the Reef Check Foundation, AFCD had also co-ordinated annual surveys of corals in Hong Kong since 2000. The results for the past three years confirmed that the coral communities in Hoi Ha Wan had shown no signs of deterioration. Nevertheless, AFCD would continue its efforts to protect the marine life in marine parks. At the request of the Chairman, the Administration undertook to provide a map depicting the locations of the existing water quality monitoring stations in Hoi Ha Wan. Meanwhile, the monitoring results of the water quality in Hoi Ha Wan were readily available on the Internet.

Admin

26. Ms Miriam LAU expressed concern about the illegal operation of sampans in the Hoi Ha Wan Marine Park which had posed safety concerns on other marine park users. AD/AFCD advised that since October 2003, AFCD had established three "Mechanized Vessels Prohibited Zone" at the main beach, around the pier and at the coral beach respectively within the Hoi Ha Wan Marine Park to prohibit the entry of power-driven vessels in order to protect the safety of people participating in water activities in those areas. The Zones had been demarcated on-site by marker buoys and it was an offence for any power-driven vessels to enter those Zones. Meetings

Action

had been held with the operators of these sampans who were warned against the continuation of their illegal operations. Joint enforcement actions had also been taken by the Marine Department, Marine Police and AFCD and the situation had since been improved.

Admin

27. The Chairman enquired about the enforcement actions taken against the food stores in Hoi Ha for illegal discharge of sewage. DSETW(ET)E2 advised that two of the stores in Hoi Ha required discharge of waste water arising from food preparation and had obtained licences under the Water Pollution Control Ordinance. Water samples taken by the Environmental Protection Department indicated that the water quality was within standards. At members' request, the Administration undertook to provide information about the sewage treatment facilities adopted by the two stores. As regards the sewage treatment system for village houses, DSETW(ET)E2 explained that it was not cost effective to build any large-scale sewage treatment system given the small population in Hoi Ha. As with other village houses, sewage from Hoi Ha Village was connected to and treated by septic tanks and soakaway systems. Ms Cyd HO pointed out that although the population in Hoi Ha was small, there was a lot of visitors and hence a need to upgrade the sewage system in the longer term for the protection of the environment.

World Wide Fund for Nature's (WWF) Hoi Ha Wan Marine Life Centre

28. Noting that there would be two tours to the WWF Hoi Ha Wan Marine Life Centre (the Centre) each day with a maximum of 40 persons per tour in its initial operation, Ms Emily LAU expressed concern about the consequential adverse impact of tourism on the ecology of the area. It was also said that the appearance of the Centre did not blend well with the surrounding environment. SMPO said that he was a member of the management and development committee for the Centre and understood that the tours to be conducted would be escorted tours. Visitors would proceed direct to the Centre which was large enough to accommodate all the visitors. AD/AFCD added that whether the appearance of the Centre was acceptable involved subjective judgement. However, as the building was screened off by a headland, it should not be too obstructive to the marine parks users. In addition, the sewage pipes would also be covered with the growth of more trees and plants along the path.. On Ms LAU's concern about the disturbance caused by WWF's glass-bottom boat, DSETW(ET)E2 said that a few routes had been worked out on a trial basis for the glass-bottom boat which was approved for use by the Marine Department. There would be regular assessment of the corals in the vicinity to provide early warnings on any potential impact of the activities on the corals.

VI. Any other business

29. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:30 pm.