



**Chairman and Members of the Panel on Environmental Affairs
Legislative Council
Legislative Council Complex,
1 Legislative Council Road,
Central, Hong Kong**

By Email Only

18 April 2012

Dear Legislators,

Meeting to discuss the Environmental and Social Impacts

in relation to the airport expansion on 23 April 2012

Thank you for arranging this special Environmental Affairs Panel meeting responding to the letter of request dated 16 February 2012 from Greenpeace and WWF. Our call was a result of the public opinion poll conducted by the University of Hong Kong showing that 73 percent of respondents think that it is important for the government to take environmental and social costs into account when considering a third runway option. The findings are in contrast to the Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK)'s summary of its consultation findings, which states that 73% of the Hong Kong public support a third runway.

The third runway project is going to be the most expensive infrastructure project in Hong Kong's history, however no comprehensive assessment based on science has been made to evaluate the environmental impacts and social costs of this project following the principles of sustainable development and proven best practices overseas. We stress that such an assessment has to be made BEFORE the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process because many of these impacts are currently NOT covered by the EIA and that NOT all environmental impacts can be mitigated. This project could bring serious and irreversible impacts with potentially far-reaching implications to Hong Kong's overall environment and living quality. We cannot blindly assume all impacts can be mitigated and dealt with them at the EIA stage. Making a fair and initial assessment of what environmental and social impacts this third runway project could bring is absolutely essential to ensure Hong Kong makes the right choice.

The undersigned environmental groups do not oppose development, but this city needs to keep abreast with the best practices elsewhere in ensuring that large development projects do not seriously threaten the living environment of the citizens. It is risky and irresponsible for Hong Kong to go ahead with the

third runway project with this big unknown and regret it 10 years later. For impacts assessed to be beyond any compensation or the current scope of mitigation available in our EIA system, Hong Kong must look into other possible measures to avoid or address those impacts before a decision on the expansion option is made. Conducting a Social Return on Investment (SROI) exercise for large infrastructure projects, such as the third runway, was supported by all three Chief Executive Election Candidates at the environmental policy forum on 3 March 2012. We hope such support will be turned into a real practice in Hong Kong, starting with this massive project.

I. Carbon emissions from aviation have not been addressed by AAHK and will not be addressed in the EIA process

The public opinion poll commissioned by WWF and Greenpeace indicated that the public were asked by AAHK to give their opinion without being presented all the important facts in relation to the airport expansion options. In particular, while carbon emissions from air traffic growth were a concern, 44.8 percent did not know whether carbon emissions were among the environmental issues that had been addressed by the AAHK in their third runway consultation, while 37.9 percent were correctly aware that the issue had not been addressed. Almost half of the respondents believe that the current EIA process will address increased carbon emissions brought by the new runway, which is incorrect. Greenhouse gases are not included under the EIAO at this time.

II. Hidden Costs yet to be Addressed

The overwhelming percentage (near 80%) of respondents, supported consideration being given to the hidden costs of carbon emissions. AAHK should not avoid responsibility for future increases in aviation emissions and discussion on their potential costs. Australia has already imposed a carbon tax on the aviation industry. The European Union has applied the Emission Trading Scheme to Hong Kong airlines. China is also considering imposing a carbon tax. In total, the estimated carbon tax to be imposed on could range up to HK\$59 billion for the next 20 years (Year 2008-2030).

The environmental Impacts currently not covered by EIA and major social impacts currently not measured for the construction of a third runway are listed in **Appendix I**.

To learn more about SORI, please view this video produced by WWF at: <http://youtu.be/wxrdpl--xHE>

III. Our asks to Legislators

The figures of this new poll demonstrate that in fact there are deep-seated public concerns on the runway's environmental and social impacts that are not currently being addressed, but which need to be. In fact, the Airport Authority Hong Kong's own consultation findings also note many concerns on aviation emissions and environmental and social costs, but to date they have been ignored by AAHK.

AAHK has refused to provide an estimation of the total carbon emissions to be generated by the third runway option despite repeated urges. WWF has requested for the monthly data of the local

greenhouse gas emissions generated from flying and local airport facilities from 2007 – 2011 but AAHK has provided us only the flight data of a one-week period which is insufficient to make sound estimation. This has demonstrated AAHK's lack of will and commitment in carbon reductions for this so-called "greenest" airport in the region.

1. The Legislative Council should demand that AAHK and the Government do not proceed straight to the statutory EIA process, unless the increase in carbon emissions facilitated by the two expansion options are clearly quantified and released for debate.
2. The Legislative Council should demand 1) the monthly data of the local greenhouse gas emissions generated from flying and local airport facilities from 2007 – 2011, 2) the monthly flight data by country and city from and to Hong Kong with detailed breakdown in passengers number and travel distance for the same period mentioned above, 3) the annual projection on demand with flight details and passengers number of the existing operation from 2012 – 2030 as well as 4) the annual estimation of additional emissions generated from the third runway. Such information will be useful for Hong Kong to have understanding of the overall carbon emissions to be generated by the third runway.
3. The Legislative Council should ask the project proponent, AAHK, to conduct a Social Return on Investment (SROI) study, which would include social and environmental costs and reveal the full economic impacts of a third runway, before making any decision on whether to proceed with planning a third runway.
4. The Legislative Council should call on the Hong Kong government to address the considerable public concerns over reclamation and carbon emissions, and impacts on Chinese white dolphin, on fisheries and on the whole of society from a potential third runway.
5. A second consultation and in-depth public debate should be conducted on the findings of a SROI study revealing all potential costs of aviation carbon emissions as well as other environmental and social costs before Hong Kong spends more than a hundred million dollars on a massive EIA. A third runway is a megaproject with major environmental and social impacts, some of which may not be possible to mitigate, and we simply don't have enough information at this time to understand its full implications, and make a well-informed decision for Hong Kong.

WWF and Greenpeace's Public Opinion Survey

Funded and commissioned by WWF and Greenpeace in Hong Kong, this public poll was conducted by the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong from 13-16 January 2012, who interviewed 1,001 Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong residents aged over 18. According to the poll's findings, respondents expressed concerns about various environmental issues: reclamation (68%), the Chinese White Dolphin (65%), carbon emissions from growth in air traffic (63%), and fisheries (58%).

The poll also indicated that the public were asked to give their opinion without being in possession of all the facts. In particular, while carbon emissions from air traffic growth were a concern, 44.8 percent did

not know whether carbon emissions were among the environmental issues that had been addressed by the AAHK in their third runway consultation. 37.9 percent were correctly aware that the issue had not been addressed. Detailed findings of the survey are enclosed in **Appendix II** for your reference.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours Truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William Yu', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Dr. William Yu

Acting Deputy Director of Conservation, WWF-Hong Kong

(on behalf of Greenpeace & Friends of the Earth)

Appendix I – Environmental Impacts currently not covered by EIA and major social impacts currently not measured for the construction of a third runway

Carbon Emissions and Cost to Flying

Considering that carbon tax on the aviation industry have been imposed by the Australian government (AUD 23.00 per tonne), and the European Union has applied Emission Trading Scheme to Hong Kong airlines, while China and New Zealand are beginning to look into similar schemes. WWF has also pointed out that the estimated total carbon tax to be imposed on Asia-Pacific flights alone from a third runway could range up to HK\$59 billion for the next 20 years (Year 2008-2030).

In the lack of such important carbon emission information, WWF has researched aviation emissions from in-bound and out-bound flights between Hong Kong and 14 regions in Asia Pacific and projected carbon emissions from aircraft in 2030 (please refer to Notes to Editor for the methodology). Taking into account only flights travelling to and from Asia-Pacific destinations, WWF's research reveals a new runway will add at least 18.1 million tonnes of carbon emission per annum in Hong Kong in 2030. This is a 75.7 % surge compared with 2008. If Hong Kong does not build the third runway, aviation emission would be 12.8 million tonnes per annum in 2030. The 5.3 million tonnes emission difference is equivalent to the carbon emissions generated by electricity consumption of all local households for about 1 year by 2030. **This raises the question as to – how an airport expansion project may offset Hong Kong's other carbon reduction efforts and responsibility to achieve the proposed carbon reduction target of Hong Kong?**

According to WWF, in 2030, aviation emissions will cause an escalation of 40% to Hong Kong's total emissions because of the third runway. The carbon cost of the aviation emissions could be range from as low as HK\$3 billion to 59 billion for the next 20 years (Year 2008-2030). WWF did not calculate the emissions from long-haul flights due to resource limitation. The expectedly huge amount of carbon emissions cost (if all flights are included) and the question of who will pay for it are currently known.

Notes:

1. The methodology of the aviation emissions projection

Four methodologies that are recommended by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SSBTA) were considered in this aviation emissions projection: bunker fuel, nationality of airline, international departures/arrivals on an aircraft basis and passenger basis. WWF-Hong Kong adopts the passenger-based calculation, which is also used by the UK government. Four factors are considered in this process: 1) Projected passenger numbers and cargo flights by 2030; 2) Emissions factors for passengers and freight flights; 3) 20% fuel efficiency improvement starting from 2020, and 4) Travel distance.

2. Carbon inventory

Aviation emissions are not currently included in the calculation of Hong Kong's total carbon inventory.

However, these form part of the carbon inventory of China, in-bound and out-bound flights between Hong Kong and China are counted as the emissions of the domestic flights.

Impacts to the Fishing Community

With regards to fisheries, WWF points out that Government has made major commitments to start restoring the marine ecosystem and to build a sustainable fishery through a ban on all trawling in Hong Kong, and a ban on commercial fishing in Marine Parks. Analysis is needed on the impact of a third runway reclamation on such a recovery, and its economic and social costs.

A study by the University of British Columbia (UBC) Fisheries Centre on the impacts of reclamation on fisheries commissioned by WWF projects the impacts of a 650 hectares potential third runway reclamation at Hong Kong International Airport, on the recovery of the marine ecosystem and the development of sustainable fisheries in the wake of the forthcoming trawling ban and ban on commercial fishing in Marine Parks. It shows that the fishing industry would likely suffer losses in value of their catches of HK\$48 million and losses in net profit of HK\$11 million over a 18 year period.

The study also reveals that the impacts on fish catches and the fishing community of a third runway reclamation are five times greater than anticipated by Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK). The new UBC figure estimates the impact of a third runway to be 0.44 percent of Hong Kong's yearly production, versus AAHK's figure of 0.08 percent. The UBC study calculated the loss against the more healthy marine ecosystem and fishery resources that will occur when trawling stops in late 2012, and other fishery management measures.

The study also shows that up to 31 non-trawler fishers are likely to lose their jobs. This is because the reclamation will reduce the expected growth in marine life such as fish, shrimp and squid populations in Hong Kong following the trawling ban. Therefore, fishers' overall catches will be lower. If the government provides full compensation and training for the fishers using current procedures, the estimated costs would be between HK\$12-31 million.

Air Pollution

Mr. David Theiss, an Economic expert at the New Economics Foundation (NEF) from the UK, one of the speakers at the WWF-Hong Kong's Third Runway Stakeholder Engagement Forum and Workshops on 29 August 2011, raised a number of concerns about the research performed in AAHK's third runway project proposal, and raised a worrying fact stating that "Decision-makers must properly evaluate the costs of unintended consequences, for example, based on AAHK's consultant reports and UK modelling, the projected increase in fine particulate matter pollution in affected areas, mainly in Tung Chung, could lead to an increase in mortality rates by nearly 13%. The possible sources of additional particulate matter are power plants, road side traffic, and new infrastructure - not limited to the proposed new runway. Such profound social costs must be considered by the Hong Kong Government when evaluating the potential cumulative impacts from different pollution sources."

Friends of the Earth (FoE) considers the airport expansion plan will damage the health of residents due to deteriorated air quality. AAHK has refused to explain to the public how the airport expansion plan will further impact air quality in Hong Kong. FoE conducted the first public opinion survey in relation to the airport expansion plan and found that over 70% of the interviewees have never heard of AAHK mentioning the impacts on air quality from the consultation for airport expansion. Over 62.6% respondents did not know that the concentration level of NO₂ will exceed the safety level once the proposed new Air Quality Objectives (AQOs) are implemented. NO₂ is a major pollutant from flight emissions. Following the standard of the proposed AQOs, the average concentration level of NO₂ exceeded the safety level in 2010 the entire Hong Kong, with the exception of Tap Mun. The level was 10% higher than safety level at Tung Chung nearby the airport, threatening the health of residents. The survey revealed that the public generally had no knowledge about the potential risks to health from deteriorated air quality to be brought by the airport expansion.

If the third runway project goes ahead, the emissions will be greatly doubled by the increased flights flying in and out Hong Kong. The increased transportation flows on land and traffic from the Hong Kong Macau Zhuhai Bridge will further compound the pollution level accumulated in North Lantau. The health of residents in Tung Chung and Tuen Mun will be at risk while road side pollution will also worsen.

AAHK must calculate and take into account all these costs to public health and disclose such information for public debate before a decision to expand the airport is made. The recently updated AQOs are far from sufficient to protect public health in the process of EIA. The Hong Kong government and AAHK must calculate these environmental impacts and social costs before the project enters the EIA process.

The vehicular flow, both logistics and tourist sides, will increase due to the expansion of the airport. However, AAHK has never provided those data to the public and no one knows about the impact from the NO_x and RSP increase besides the increases of flights. AAHK should analysis the “contribution” of pollutants on the roadside and what is the impact to the Tung Chung residents.

Please see more details at FoE’s press release:

http://www.foe.org.hk/welcome/gettc.asp?language=tc&id_path=1,%207,%2028,%20150,%204568,%204763

香港大學民意研究計劃
世界自然基金會香港分會
綠色和平
市民對興建第三條機場跑道意見調查
18 Jan 2012

樣本資料

調查日期:13-16/1/2012
總樣本: 1,001
調查方法: 透過訪問員以隨機電話訪問形式進行
訪問對象: 18歲或以上操粵語的香港居民
有效回應比率: 66.8%
標準誤差: 少於 1.6% (在95%置信水平下為 +/-3.2%)

* 原始數據已按照政府統計處提供之2011年中全港18歲或以上人口的年齡及性別分佈初步統計數字，以「加權」方法作出調整，以增加數據的整體代表性。

Q1 你認為政府現時係經濟發展同埋環境保護之間，平衡得好唔好？

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 平衡良好	264	26.4	26.6	26.6
	2 不好—太著重經濟發展	557	55.6	56.0	82.6
	3 不好—太著重環境保護	63	6.3	6.3	88.9
	8888 唔知/難講	110	11.0	11.1	100.0
	Total	994	99.3	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒答	7	.7		
Total		1001	100.0		

Q2照你所知，下面同環境有關既議題，機管局有冇係第三條跑道既公眾諮詢中提出？[訪員逐個項目讀出]

- 航班增長所帶來既溫室氣體排放量

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 有	173	17.2	17.2	17.2
	2 冇	380	37.9	37.9	55.2
	8888 唔知道	449	44.8	44.8	100.0
	Total	1001	100.0	100.0	

Q3照你所知，下面同環境有關既議題，機管局有冇係第三條跑道既公眾諮詢中提出？[訪員逐個項目讀出]

- 海洋生態

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 有	383	38.2	38.3	38.3
	2 冇	307	30.6	30.6	68.9
	8888 唔知道	311	31.1	31.1	100.0
	Total	1000	99.9	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒答	1	.1		
Total		1001	100.0		

Q4 就機場興建第三條跑道可能對環境構成既影響而言，你有幾重視或者唔重視以下既問題？

[訪員追問程度] - 中華白海豚問題

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 好重視	249	24.9	25.0	25.0
	2 幾重視	398	39.8	40.0	65.0
	3 一半半	146	14.6	14.6	79.6

	4 唔係幾重視	134	13.4	13.5	93.1
	5 完全唔重視	25	2.5	2.5	95.6
	8888 唔知道	44	4.4	4.4	100.0
	Total	997	99.6	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒答	4	.4		
Total		1001	100.0		

Q5 就機場興建第三條跑道可能對環境構成既影響而言，你有幾重視或者唔重視以下既問題？

[訪員追問程度] - 填海問題

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 好重視	284	28.4	28.5	28.5
	2 幾重視	389	38.9	39.0	67.5
	3 一半半	129	12.9	13.0	80.4
	4 唔係幾重視	124	12.4	12.4	92.9
	5 完全唔重視	25	2.5	2.5	95.3
	8888 唔知道	47	4.6	4.7	100.0
	Total	998	99.7	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒答	3	.3		
Total		1001	100.0		

Q6 就機場興建第三條跑道可能對環境構成既影響而言，你有幾重視或者唔重視以下既問題？

[訪員追問程度] - 漁獲問題

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 好重視	233	23.3	23.5	23.5
	2 幾重視	342	34.1	34.3	57.8
	3 一半半	136	13.6	13.7	71.5
	4 唔係幾重視	191	19.1	19.2	90.7
	5 完全唔重視	39	3.9	3.9	94.6
	8888 唔知道	53	5.3	5.4	100.0
	Total	995	99.4	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒答	6	.6		
Total		1001	100.0		

Q7 就機場興建第三條跑道可能對環境構成既影響而言，你有幾重視或者唔重視以下既問題？

[訪員追問程度] - 額外航班帶來既溫室氣體排放

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 好重視	255	25.5	25.6	25.6
	2 幾重視	372	37.1	37.3	62.9
	3 一半半	120	12.0	12.1	75.0
	4 唔係幾重視	154	15.4	15.4	90.4
	5 完全唔重視	27	2.7	2.7	93.1
	8888 唔知道	69	6.9	6.9	100.0
	Total	996	99.5	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒答	5	.5		
Total		1001	100.0		

Q8 照你所知，以下邊一D問題會係法定環境影響評估程序中處理？

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
	1000	99.9%	1	.1%	1001	100.0%

	Responses		
	N	Percent	Percent of Cases
1 空氣質素	649	23.4%	64.9%
5 水質	538	19.4%	53.8%
2 噪音問題	535	19.3%	53.5%
3 溫室氣體排放	473	17.0%	47.2%
4 生態系統	459	16.5%	45.9%
8886 以上皆否	30	1.1%	3.0%
8888 唔知道	94	3.4%	9.4%
Total	2778	100.0%	

Q9 你認為政府係計算第三條跑道既成本時，應不應該顧及潛在既「碳排放稅」成本？[訪員追問程度]

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 好應該	388	38.7	38.7	38.7
	2 幾應該	389	38.9	38.9	77.6
	3 一半半	35	3.5	3.5	81.1
	4 幾不應該	39	3.9	3.9	85.0
	5 好不應該	15	1.5	1.5	86.5
	8888 唔知／難講／唔明白	135	13.5	13.5	100.0
	Total	1001	100.0	100.0	

Q10 係考慮興建第三條跑道時，你認為政府應該有幾重視或者唔重視以下既因素？[訪員追問程度] - 新跑道帶來既經濟效益

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 好重視	491	49.1	49.1	49.1
	2 幾重視	387	38.7	38.7	87.9
	3 一半半	46	4.6	4.6	92.4
	4 唔係幾重視	27	2.7	2.7	95.1
	5 完全唔重視	3	.3	.3	95.4
	8888 唔知道	46	4.6	4.6	100.0
	Total	1000	99.9	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒答	1	.1		
Total		1001	100.0		

Q11 係考慮興建第三條跑道時，你認為政府應該有幾重視或者唔重視以下既因素？[訪員追問程度] - 環境及社會成本 (如空氣污染情況會惡化、為社會帶來醫療成本等)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 好重視	379	37.8	38.1	38.1
	2 幾重視	349	34.8	35.1	73.2
	3 一半半	91	9.1	9.1	82.3
	4 唔係幾重視	114	11.4	11.5	93.8
	5 完全唔重視	22	2.2	2.3	96.0
	8888 唔知道	39	3.9	4.0	100.0
	Total	994	99.3	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒答	7	.7		
Total		1001	100.0		

Q12 係考慮興建第三條跑道時，你認為政府應該有幾重視或者唔重視以下既因素？[訪員追問程度] - 機場周邊居民健康問題

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 好重視	359	35.8	36.0	36.0
	2 幾重視	325	32.4	32.6	68.6

	3 一半半	97	9.7	9.7	78.4
	4 唔係幾重視	143	14.3	14.3	92.7
	5 完全唔重視	31	3.1	3.1	95.9
	8888 唔知道	41	4.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	996	99.5	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒答	5	.5		
Total		1001	100.0		

Q13 珠三角地區既航空交通日漸繁忙，航空業所產生既溫室氣體排放預料會有所增加，你認為政府可以推行以下邊d建議以幫助減少排放？

		Cases					
		Valid		Missing		Total	
		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
		1000	99.9%	1	.1%	1001	100.0%
		Responses					
		N	Percent	Percent of Cases			
	1 與珠江三角州各地合作減排	679	34.9%	67.9%			
	4 要求航空公司提升燃油效益	433	22.3%	43.3%			
	2 實施碳排放稅	374	19.2%	37.4%			
	3 要求航空公司實施碳補償制度	345	17.7%	34.5%			
	8886 以上皆否	24	1.2%	2.4%			
	8888 唔知／難講／唔明白	89	4.6%	8.9%			
Total		1943	100.0%				

被訪者背景資料

sex [S6] 性別

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 男	458	45.7	45.7	45.7
	2 女	543	54.3	54.3	100.0
	Total	1001	100.0	100.0	

age 年齡

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 18 - 19	29	2.8	2.9	2.9
	2 20 - 29	163	16.3	16.4	19.3
	3 30 - 39	186	18.6	18.7	38.0
	4 40 - 49	204	20.4	20.5	58.5
	5 50 - 59	191	19.1	19.2	77.7
	6 60 或以上	221	22.1	22.3	100.0
	Total	995	99.4	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒絕回答	6	.6		
Total		1001	100.0		

edu 教育程度

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 小學畢業或以下	134	13.4	13.4	13.4
	2 中一至中三(初中)	140	14.0	14.0	27.5
	3 中四至中五(高中)	273	27.3	27.4	54.9
	4 中六至中七(預科)	64	6.4	6.4	61.3
	5 專上非學位	66	6.6	6.6	67.9

	6 專上學位	277	27.7	27.8	95.7
	7 研究院或以上	42	4.2	4.3	100.0
	Total	996	99.5	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒絕回答	5	.5		
Total		1001	100.0		

edugp 教育程度

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 小學或以下	134	13.4	13.4	13.4
	2 中學	477	47.6	47.9	61.3
	3 大專或以上	385	38.5	38.7	100.0
	Total	996	99.5	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒絕回答	5	.5		
Total		1001	100.0		

occ 職位

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 老闆/經理/行政人員	83	8.3	8.4	8.4
	2 專業人員	91	9.1	9.2	17.6
	3 輔助專業人員	68	6.8	6.9	24.5
	4 文員	122	12.2	12.3	36.8
	5 服務工作人員	52	5.2	5.3	42.0
	6 商店銷售人員	15	1.5	1.5	43.6
	7 漁農業熟練工人	2	.2	.2	43.7
	8 手工藝及有關人員	20	2.0	2.0	45.8
	9 機台及機器操作員及裝配員	10	1.0	1.0	46.8
	10 司機	13	1.3	1.3	48.1
	11 非技術工人	37	3.7	3.7	51.8
	12 學生	99	9.9	10.0	61.8
	13 家庭主婦	159	15.9	16.1	77.9
	14 家庭傭工	1	.1	.1	78.0
	15 不能辨別	7	.7	.7	78.6
	16 退休	175	17.4	17.6	96.3
	17 失業/待業	31	3.1	3.2	99.5
	8887 其他職位	5	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	989	98.8	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒絕回答	12	1.2		
Total		1001	100.0		

occgp 職位

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 行政及專業人員	242	24.2	24.5	24.5
	2 文職及服務人員	189	18.9	19.1	43.6
	3 勞動工人	81	8.1	8.2	51.8
	4 學生	99	9.9	10.0	61.8
	5 家庭主婦	159	15.9	16.1	77.9
	6 其他	219	21.8	22.1	100.0
	Total	989	98.8	100.0	
Missing	-99 拒絕回答	12	1.2		
Total		1001	100.0		