

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1) 329/06-07
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

Panel on Environmental Affairs

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 23 October 2006, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

- Members present** : Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP (Chairman)
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon SIN Chung-kai, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yea, GBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP
Hon TAM Heung-man
- Member attending** : Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yea, GBS, JP
- Members absent** : Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
- Public officers attending** : **For item IV**
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Roy TANG
Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (3)

Mr MOK Wai-chuen
Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Mobile
Source Control)

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 (1)4

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 106/06-07 — Minutes of the meeting held on
12 October 2006)

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2006 were confirmed.

II. Information paper issued since last meeting

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

III. Items for discussion at the next meeting

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 108/06-07(01) — List of follow-up actions
LC Paper No. CB(1) 108/06-07(02) — List of outstanding items for
discussion)

3. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting
scheduled for Monday, 27 November 2006, at 2:30 pm –

- (a) Review of Air Quality Objectives;
- (b) Tax incentives to promote the use of environment friendly cars; and
- (c) 4339DS – North District Sewerage Stage 1 Phases 2B and 2C and
Stage 2 Phase 1.

On item (a) “Review of Air Quality Objectives”, members agreed that experts should be invited to give their views on the subject, and that the Administration should append to the discussion paper an update on the extent of regional air pollution on the air quality of Hong Kong, the latest progress of the measures taken by the Mainland authorities in tackling the problem and the improvement made so far.

Action

4. Referring to the list of outstanding items for discussion, Miss CHOY So-yuk enquired about the feasibility of advancing discussion on the “Progress report on the implementation of the Policy Framework for the Management of Municipal Solid Waste” and the “Proposed legislation on Producer Responsibility Schemes”. The Chairman said that the scheduled time for discussion of the subject had in fact been advanced pursuant to her request at the meeting with the Administration on the annual work plan. DDEP(3) undertook to relay Miss CHOY’s request to the Administration for further consideration.

5. Noting that the “Proposal of encouraging owners of old diesel commercial vehicles to replace their old vehicles by offering one-off grant” was scheduled for discussion in December 2006, Ms Miriam LAU questioned if the time table could be adhered to since details of the proposal had yet to be disclosed by the Administration to the trades for consultation. She held the view that these details should have been worked out and made available to the trades as soon as the proposal was announced by the Administration. DDEP(3) explained that it was not the practice of the Administration to disclose policy initiatives before the Policy Address was delivered by the Chief Executive. He added that the one-off grant to be provided under the replacement scheme for pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles would be about 12% and 18% of the average taxable value of the respective vehicle class. The Administration had actually commenced consultation with the trades on the proposal and would be reporting the outcome to the Panel in December 2006.

6. The Chairman suggested and members agreed that the control of greenhouse gas emission to mitigate global warming should be included in the list of outstanding items for discussion, and that experts should be invited to give their views when the subject was discussed.

7. As the Chairman was unable to attend the meeting in December 2006, members agreed that the meeting originally scheduled for 21 December 2006 be advanced to 19 December 2006 at 8:30 am.

IV. A proposal to retrofit long idling pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicles with emission reduction devices

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 34/06-07(01) — 2006-2007 Policy Agenda - Policy Initiatives of the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau

LC Paper No. CB(1) 108/06-07(03) — Paper provided by the Administration)

Retrofitting of long idling pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicles with emission reduction devices

8. DDEP(3) briefed members on the Administration’s proposal to make it mandatory for long idling pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicles to be retrofitted with emission reduction devices by highlighting the salient points in the information paper.

Action

He added that the present proposal would be implemented with existing resources, and there would be no additional financial or civil service implications.

9. While expressing in-principle support for the proposal, Miss CHOY So-yuk held the view that the proposal, together with other initiatives to encourage the replacement of polluting vehicles with environment friendly models, would not serve the intended purpose unless they were complemented with a mandatory requirement to phase out highly polluting pre-Euro and Euro I diesel vehicles. She therefore suggested that a specified timeframe, say 2010, should be set whereby all pre-Euro diesel vehicles (which would then be in use for at least 18 years) would be banned from the roads. DDEP(3) said that the Government had no intention to impose a ban on pre-Euro and Euro I diesel vehicles given the high costs of these vehicles and the financial implications of the proposed ban on the transport trades which were already facing difficult times. Through the voluntary retrofit programme for long idling pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicles, which was concluded in December 2005, 95% of the eligible vehicles had been installed with emission reduction devices. The proposal to make the installation mandatory would ensure that owners of the remaining 5% vehicles would retrofit their vehicles with emission reduction devices, given that pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicles emitted 30 times more particulates than Euro IV models.

10. Ms Emily LAU asked if effort had been made to ascertain why the remaining 5% pre-Euro diesel vehicle owners did not participate in the voluntary retrofit programme. DDEP(3) said that the Administration had thrice written to the affected vehicle owners, both before and during the voluntary retrofit programme, informing them of its plan to make the installation of emission reduction devices mandatory after the completion of the programme. While the reasons for non-participation were unknown, it was believed that some of the owners might have plans to retire the vehicles soon. Ms LAU further enquired if licences of the remaining 5% vehicles would be subject to cancellation in the event of non-compliance with the mandatory installation requirement after it took effect on 1 April 2007. DDEP(3) answered in the affirmative. He however pointed out that these owners could re-apply for vehicle licences upon installation of the emission reduction devices.

11. Noting that about 150 registered cross-boundary pre-Euro long idling vehicles would continue to be exempted since no suitable emission reduction devices could be identified for these vehicles due to technological constraints, Ms Emily LAU enquired about the exact number of such vehicles lest some of them might not have been registered. She also asked if there were any means to reduce emissions from these vehicles. The Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Mobile Source Control) (PEPO(MSC)) explained that long idling vehicles were required to run their engines for operating on-board equipment while stationary. In such operation, the engines did not have to work hard. Thus, the temperature of the exhaust was usually not high enough for a catalytic emission reduction device to function properly, particularly when the vehicles were not using ultra-low sulphur diesel. Therefore, cross-boundary pre-Euro long idling vehicles were exempted from the mandatory installation requirement. DDEP(3) added that all cross-boundary pre-Euro long idling vehicles had to be registered with the Administration. Increase in the number of these vehicles was not expected as import of such vehicles was no longer allowed.

Action

12. Mr LEE Wing-tat was concerned about the efficacy of the emission reduction devices, which according to a local expert would decrease with time. These devices were most effective in the first year of operation and their effectiveness would decrease exponentially if they were not properly maintained and cleansed. He enquired if the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had conducted surveys on proper maintenance of emission reduction devices by vehicle owners. PEPO(MSC) said that there were two kinds of emission reduction devices. The one that required regular cleansing was for small vehicles only while the other was for both light and heavy diesel vehicles and used catalysts to help oxidize particulates without the need for cleansing. The catalytic type of emission reduction devices had been tried out by the trades for about a year and the results were satisfactory. The devices did not require any maintenance, but proper vehicle maintenance was needed to prevent premature failure of these devices. When these devices were due for replacement, vehicle owners would know because particulates would start accumulating in the devices causing the engine performance to deteriorate.

13. The Chairman enquired about the extent to which the voluntary retrofit programme for long idling pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicles had improved the air quality in Hong Kong. PEPO(MSC) said that it was difficult to quantify the improvement to air quality as a result of the voluntary retrofit programme, which only involved 2 500 long idling pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicles. It was however worth to note that the particulate emissions of a pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicle would be reduced by 30% with the installation of an emission reduction device. If all the pre-Euro diesel vehicles in Hong Kong were retrofitted with emission reduction devices, the total respirable suspended particulates (RSP) emissions would be reduced by 10% to 20%.

14. Instead of making it mandatory for the installation of emission reduction devices, Miss CHOY So-yuk opined that it would be more effective to introduce an emission standard for retrofitted long idling pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicles, failing which the owners would be subject to cancellation of vehicle licences. She said that the proposed arrangement was more scientific and would be able to assess the actual emission performance of the vehicles. DDEP(3) said that all long idling pre-Euro heavy diesel vehicles had to meet the required emission standards before they were imported to Hong Kong. As such, it would not be appropriate to introduce another statutory emission standard after these vehicles had been retrofitted with emission reduction devices. Besides, the proposed arrangement was not applicable to light and heavy diesel vehicles under other retrofitting programmes. Miss CHOY asked how the Administration could ensure the mandatory installation of emission reduction devices by vehicle owners. PEPO(MSC) explained that the enforcing officers would conduct on-the-road spot checks on vehicles to ensure the installation of emission reduction devices. Vehicle owners failing to comply with the installation requirement would be liable to cancellation of their vehicle licences.

Provision of incentives for the early replacement of pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles with Euro IV vehicles

15. Referring to the policy initiative of earmarking \$3.2 billion to provide a one-off grant to encourage the early replacement of 74 000 pre-Euro and Euro I diesel

Action

commercial vehicles with Euro IV vehicles, Mr SIN Chung-kai enquired if objective studies would be conducted to ascertain the cost-effectiveness of the one-off grant. DDEP(3) explained that emission from power generation was the largest source of air pollution in Hong Kong followed by vehicular emission. Diesel vehicles were found to be the most polluting among all vehicles and accounted for almost 90% and 80% of the total RPS and nitrous oxides (NO_x) emissions from vehicles respectively. If all pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles were replaced with Euro IV models, the vehicular emissions of RSP and NO_x would be reduced by 74% and 38% respectively. The territory-wide emissions of RSP and NO_x would be reduced by 18% and 10% respectively. Therefore, the replacement of pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles with Euro IV models would be effective in reducing air pollution.

16. Miss CHOY So-yuk noted that the anticipated improvement to air quality was made on the assumption that all pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles were replaced with Euro IV models. She reiterated that the replacement scheme could not be completed without a ban on pre-Euro and Euro I diesel vehicles. She was also concerned about the long lead time for the scheme, which would only be launched in the second quarter of 2007, lest owners of these polluting vehicles would tend to wait for the incentive scheme even if their vehicles were long due for replacement. In order to encourage the early replacement of polluting vehicles to bring about the needed improvement to air quality, Miss CHOY suggested that consideration should be given to providing the one-off grant with retrospective effect, so that owners who replaced their pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles with Euro IV models after the 2006-2007 Policy Address would also be entitled to the one-off grant. Mrs Selina CHOW echoed that the long lead time for various incentive schemes would invariably have impact on the sales of vehicles during the interim as owners would not consider purchasing/replacing their vehicles until the launching of these schemes. Given that the incentives schemes were well supported by the Legislative Council (LegCo) on account of their benefits to the environment, she failed to see why these schemes, details of which should have been worked out before they were announced in the Policy Address, could not be implemented earlier so that the owners would not have to wait for a long time to purchase/replace their vehicles.

17. DDEP(3) said that the time-tables for various replacement schemes were tentatively worked out taking into account the need to consult the trades and LegCo before the relevant funding proposals were submitted to the Finance Committee (FC) for approval. By way of illustration, there should be adequate consultation with the trades, particularly on the formulation of fuel efficiency standards which were presently only available for Japanese cars but not for European models, before the implementation of the incentive scheme to encourage the use of environment friendly cars. Once the relevant fuel efficiency standards were formulated, the scheme could be launched within a short time. As regards the incentive scheme on replacement of pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles with Euro IV models, this had to be implemented in April 2007 as no financial provisions had been earmarked in the 2006-2007 budget for such purpose. He added that it might not be possible to provide the replacement scheme with retrospective effect in view of the difficulties and financial implications associated with the proposal. Besides, he believed that owners would not mind waiting for a little longer for the replacement of their vehicles.

Action

18. Given the wide range of pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles, Ms Emily LAU enquired if studies had been conducted on the levels of incentives to be set for different types of vehicles. DDEP(3) said that in working out the replacement scheme for pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles, reference had been made to the Liquefied Petrol Gas (PLG) Taxi Scheme and the Diesel Light Bus Replacement Scheme. However, unlike the replacement schemes for taxis and light buses where the replacement vehicles were within a fixed price range, the replacement cost for pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles could range from \$100,000 to \$1 million. In this connection, consideration was being given to setting the levels of incentives for replacing pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles at about 12% and 18% of the average taxable value of the relevant vehicle class respectively. A higher level of incentive was set for Euro I vehicles since they were relatively newer than pre-Euro diesel vehicles. The affected trades would be duly consulted on the detailed arrangements for the replacement scheme. At members' request, DDEP(3) undertook to include a table setting out the levels of incentives for replacement of pre-Euro and Euro I diesel commercial vehicles, the basis upon which these levels was arrived at and the prescribed periods within which the incentives for respective vehicle types were granted in the paper on the replacement scheme to be submitted for discussion by the Panel in December 2006. Ms LAU further requested that the improvement to air quality brought about by the replacement scheme should also be included in order to justify the cost of \$3.2 billion for the scheme.

Admin

Procurement of Government vehicles

19. Referring to the Administration's recent decision to replace 36 existing vehicles with a model which was said to be low in fuel efficiency, Miss CHOY So-yuk said that the decision ran contrary to the Chief Executive's policy direction of providing incentives to encourage the use of environment friendly vehicles with low emissions and high fuel efficiency. DDEP(3) said that the purchase of Government vehicles fell under the purview of the Government Logistics Department (GLD). He however pointed out that it had taken a long time for EPD to formulate proposals to incentivize the use of environment friendly vehicles, and that the proposed qualifying environmental standards of these vehicles were only worked out in September 2006. According to his understanding, GLD had invited tenders for the 36 replacement vehicles in April 2006 at which the proposed emission and fuel efficiency standards for environment friendly vehicles under the incentive scheme were yet to be drawn up. In considering the procurement of the 36 replacement vehicles, GLD had to take into account the performance of the vehicles to meet the prevailing Euro IV emission standards, albeit not the fuel efficiency standards, as well as the capital and maintenance costs of the vehicles.

20. Miss CHOY So-yuk however pointed out that Members had been repeatedly requesting for the replacement of government fleet with environment friendly vehicles in numerous occasions over the past two years. She questioned why such requests were ignored in the procurement of Government vehicles. Expressing similar concern, Ms Emily LAU noted that FC's approval was not sought for the procurement of the 36 replacement vehicles. This might be due to the fact that the cost of

Action

replacement was less than the threshold of \$15 million. Notwithstanding, she still considered that the Administration should have consulted LegCo, particularly when the replacement vehicles failed to meet the prevailing environmental standards. DDEP(3) said that the Administration was committed to the green procurement policy and GLD was well aware of the need to procure environment friendly products. However, it would not be fair to pinpoint on a decision made by GLD in April 2006 when the proposed emission and fuel efficiency standards for environment friendly private cars was only drawn up by EPD in September 2006.

21. The Chairman enquired if consideration could be given to withholding the purchase of the 36 vehicles which could not meet the proposed emission and fuel efficiency standards. DDEP(3) said that he was not in a position to respond to the question as this fell under the jurisdiction of GLD. The Chairman suggested and members agreed that a letter should be written to the Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (SFST) conveying the Panel's concern about the Administration's decision in its procurement of the 36 vehicles for the government fleet.

(Post-meeting note: The letter to SFST and the Administration's reply were circulated to members vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1)171/06-07(01) and (02) respectively on 26 October 2006.)

Control on idling engines

22. Mr LEE Wing-tat opined that there was a need to ban idling vehicles with running engines (idling vehicles) as emissions from these vehicles would directly affect roadside air quality and have adverse impact on public health. This was evidenced by the surge of the number of complaints against idling vehicles from 238 in 2002 to 308 in 2005, representing an increase of about 30%. He opined that if the Administration was determined to tackle the problem, it should go ahead with the banning of idling vehicles without the need for further consultation, adding that similar consultation exercise conducted in 2001 had yielded no consensus. As such, the proposed consultation in early 2007 would serve no useful purpose other than inviting further objections from the trades. He stressed that public interest should take precedence over that of the trades which should abide by the ban.

23. DDEP(3) said that the public consultation on the proposal to ban idling vehicles was conducted between 2000 and 2001 during which all stakeholders, including LegCo, District Councils, transport trades and relevant parties, were consulted. As no consensus could be reached, the proposal was not taken further. The proposal was later deliberated at length at the Council meeting as well as the joint meeting of the Panel on Environmental Affairs and the Panel on Transport. It was decided that an educational approach should be adopted to encourage drivers to turn off their engines while waiting. Non-compliance was not subject to any penalty. As the educational approach was not found to be effective in the control of idling vehicles over the past five years, it was considered necessary that further consultation be conducted to gauge public views on the proposed ban given the increase in the number of complaints received. Information on overseas experience on how the ban was enforced would also be included in the consultation. He stressed that the

Action

Government had no intention to procrastinate the proposal. However, the Administration had received divided views from political parties on the control of idling vehicles prior to the delivery of the Policy Address. Hence, there was a need for further public consultation.

24. Mr LEE Wing-tat recalled that a motion urging for the use of legislative control over idling vehicles was carried at the Council meeting on 7 December 2005. With the support of LegCo, the Administration should exercise its strong governance to introduce a simple and direct legislation to ban idling vehicles across the territory without hesitation. DDEP(3) thanked members for their support which had given the Administration much confidence in the control of idling vehicles. However, there was still a need to consult the stakeholders.

25. Miss CHOY So-yuk opined that the Administration was trying to threaten drivers to turn off their engines while waiting with statutory control without the real intention of legislating. She stressed that statutory control was an essential tool to control idling vehicles. To minimize the impact on the trades, consideration should be given to implementing a limited ban on idling vehicles in selected areas, such as schools, hospitals and government buildings, which would be much easier than a territory-wide ban which would take years to complete. DDEP(3) stressed that the Administration was committed to tackling the problem. While there was general support for the control of idling vehicles, there were divided views among the different political parties on how this should be done as evidenced by the motion debate.

26. Mrs Selina CHOW said that it was a good practice for drivers to turn off their engines while waiting. Apart from conducting a further public consultation, she enquired if the Administration would consider introducing incentives rather than legislation to control idling vehicles as she was aware that some trades would have difficulties in complying with a ban on idling vehicles. By way of illustration, the tourist bus drivers would have difficulties to turn off their engines while waiting as tourists, especially those who were not accustomed to the hot weather in Hong Kong, would most likely complain if the air conditioning was turned off while the vehicles were waiting. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that he appreciated the difficulties which some of the trades would encounter in complying with the control on idling vehicles, but there was a need for the control in an attempt to reduce vehicular emissions for the benefit of the environment. He suggested that tour guides should explain the situation to the tourists so as to obtain their understanding.

27. DDEP(3) said that efforts, in cooperation with some political parties and concerned groups, had been made to educate the public on the need to control idling vehicles following the public consultation in 2001. Despite these efforts, the number of complaints against idling vehicles had increased. This had led to the passing of the motion at the Council meeting to ban idling vehicles. While some Members had urged for the introduction of legislation to control idling vehicles, there was a need to consult the public with a view to mapping out a practical means to control idling vehicles. He hoped that LegCo would continue to support the Administration in this regard.

Action

Regional air quality

28. Mr LEE Wing-tat enquired about the improvement to regional air quality following the implementation of the Regional Air Quality Management Plan with the Guangdong Provincial Government (GPG). DDEP(3) said that GPG's earlier decision to freeze the construction of power plants was lifted in 2002 in order to meet the surging demand for energy as a result of the increased pace of industrialization in the Pearl River Delta (PRD) Region. Since then, a number of cleaner power plants, some equipped with desulphurization facilities and others using liquefied natural gas (LNG), were commissioned between 2004 and 2005. Based on a report released in April 2006, it was observed that sulphur dioxide concentrations in Guangdong had shown a decrease for the first time ever. It was expected that this could be sustained with continuing efforts to reduce emissions. The Administration would publish the first report of monitoring results of the joint air quality monitoring network in PRD in October 2006.

29. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that he was not optimistic that the agreed emission reduction targets could be achieved by 2010. He considered that more efforts should be made by both sides to reduce emissions. DDEP(3) said that the issue of environmental protection was high on the agenda of every meeting between the Chief Executive and GPG officials. GPG was committed to improving the environment through the use of more environmental practices and relocation of polluting industries outside Guangdong. It was also worth to note that the use of desulphurization facilities and LNG for power generation in Guangdong was very effective in reducing emissions. While Guangdong contributed to 80% of the total emissions from the PRD Region, emissions from Hong Kong would also affect Guangdong depending on the direction of wind.

30. Ms Emily LAU enquired about the efficacy of imposing emission caps on power plants in Hong Kong in meeting the 2010 emission reduction targets. DDEP(3) explained that emission caps were first imposed on Castle Peak Power Station on 1 August 2005 upon renewal of licence. Subsequently, emission caps had also been imposed on Black Point Power Station and Lamma Power Station through renewal of their licences. The Administration would progressively tighten the relevant caps to meet 2010 emission reduction targets upon further renewal of their licences in 2007. The same arrangement was applicable to Hong Kong Electric Company Limited as well. Ms LAU opined that the Administration had not been exerting enough pressure on the power companies to reduce emissions. She urged that more action should be taken to expedite emission reduction. DDEP(3) explained that instead of using concentration as a means to control emissions, the Administration had decided to impose emission caps as the latter was found to be more effective in the control of emissions. However, emissions caps could not have been imposed earlier since new conditions could only be applied upon renewal of licences in 2005. Meanwhile, the Administration had been assisting power companies in the control of emissions and the conduct of environmental impact assessments (EIA) on the proposed LNG receiving facility.

Action

31. Miss CHOY So-yuk noted that both Tai A Chau and Sokos Island were considered suitable for the LNG receiving facility, and it appeared that the Administration might have a preference over Tai A Chau due to the opposition against the provision of the LNG receiving facility at Sokos Island from Tuen Mun residents. She however pointed out that Tuen Mun residents might not be aware of the fact that the site at Sokos Island might be used for the provision of a more polluting incinerator. She opined that Tuen Mun residents should be apprised of the development of the site and the related environmental impacts. She also cautioned that if the LNG receiving facility were to be provided at Tai A Chau, a large underwater protective shield would have to be constructed, which might have an adverse impact on the marine environment in the surrounding area. Expressing similar concern, Mr SIN Chung-kai asked whether it was possible to provide for common conveyance systems for LNG and other gas utilities in an attempt to minimize the environmental damages associated with the construction of the facilities. He also agreed to the need to consult affected residents on the choice of site for the development of obnoxious facilities. DDEP(3) said that the CLP Power had just completed an EIA study on the LNG receiving facility, which would be available for public inspection if the EIA report met the technical requirements in accordance with the provision of the law. He added that where a site was identified for the provision of obnoxious facilities, the Administration would arrange to notify and consult the affected residents.

32. Ms Emily LAU said that the choice of site for obnoxious facilities was a thorny issue. It would be best if the Administration could have prior discussions with the political parties/concern groups and obtain their consensus before taking forward the projects. The same should apply to the control of idling vehicles.

V. Any other business

33. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:26 pm.