

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1992/11-12  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/EA/1

**Panel on Environmental Affairs**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 23 April 2012, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon CHAN Hak-kan (Chairman)  
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo  
Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP  
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP  
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, JP  
Hon IP Wai-ming, MH  
Hon Tanya CHAN

**Member absent** : Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP

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

Dr Kitty POON  
Under Secretary for the Environment

Miss Amy YUEN  
Assistant Director (Water Policy)  
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Alex NG  
Principal Environmental Protection Officer  
(Sewerage Infrastructure)  
Environmental Protection Department

Mr CHAN Kin-kwong  
Assistant Director (Projects and Development)  
Drainage Services Department

Mr TAI Wai-man  
Chief Engineer (Consultants Management)  
Drainage Services Department

Mr LAI Cheuk-ho  
Chief Engineer (Sewerage Projects)  
Drainage Services Department

**For item V**

Mrs Sharon YIP  
Deputy Secretary for Transport & Housing  
(Transport)

Ms Jenny CHAN  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport &  
Housing (Transport)

Mr Stanley HUI  
Chief Executive Officer  
Airport Authority Hong Kong

Mr Wilson FUNG  
Executive Director  
Corporate Development  
Airport Authority Hong Kong

Mr C K NG  
Executive Director  
Airport Operations  
Airport Authority Hong Kong

Mr Kevin POOLE  
Deputy Director  
Projects  
Airport Authority Hong Kong

Mr TSE Chin-wan  
Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department

**Attendance by invitation : For item V**

WWF Hong Kong

Dr William YU  
Acting Deputy Director of Conservation

Greeners Action

Ms YIP Chui-man  
Senior Project Officer

Hong Kong Dolphin Conservation Society

Dr Samuel HUNG  
Chairman

Friends of the Earth (HK)

Mr Thomas CHOI  
Senior Environmental Affairs Officer

Green Sense

Ms HO Ka-po  
Project Manager

The Conservancy Association

Mr NG Hei-man  
Senior Campaign Officer

Clean Air Network

Ms CHAN Fong-ying  
Campaign Manager

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

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

Miss Mandy POON  
Legislative Assistant (1)1

---

Action

**I. Confirmation of minutes**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)1493/11-12 — Minutes of the meeting held on  
27 February 2012)

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2012 were confirmed.

**II. Information paper issued since last meeting**

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

**III. Items for discussion at the next meeting**

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1594/11-12(01) — List of follow-up actions  
LC Paper No. CB(1) 1594/11-12(02) — List of outstanding items for  
discussion)

3. The Chairman advised that the Administration had proposed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting scheduled for Monday, 28 May 2012, at 2:30 pm –

(a) 274DS (part) – Yuen Long and Kam Tin sewerage, stage 3 and  
332DS – Lam Tsuen Valley sewerage, stage 2; and

(b) Trial of electric buses by franchised bus companies.

He also drew members' attention to Mr KAM Nai-wai's written request for discussion of the subject on "Buildings Energy Efficiency Funding Schemes". Members subsequently agreed to include the subject in the agenda of the next meeting.

4. The Chairman recalled that at the special meeting held on 20 April 2012, Ms Cyd HO suggested holding another meeting to discuss with deputations the policies on incineration and landfills. Given that deputations had already been invited to express their views at the earlier meetings on 26 March 2012, and that the Administration had withdrawn the funding proposals for the construction of

the Integrated Waste Management Facilities and extension of landfills, the Chairman suggested that the subject should be placed on the list of outstanding items for discussion by the Panel. While agreeing that it would be more fruitful to discuss the way forward on waste management after the new term of Government resumed office, Ms Miriam LAU considered that there was room for further improvement in respect of waste reduction and recycling which the Panel should follow up. Her views were shared by Professor Patrick LAU and Ms Audrey EU who also suggested inviting waste recyclers to express their views in this respect. Ms LAU held the view that tenants of the EcoPark should also be invited to share their experience. The Chairman said that he would liaise with the Administration regarding the timeframe for discussion of the subject.

5. In view of the low subscription rate of the one-off grant scheme to encourage the early replacement of Euro II diesel commercial vehicles, Ms Miriam LAU said that there might be a need for the Panel to discuss with the Administration on the means to enhance the attractiveness of the scheme before its expiry next year. Noting that the subject was discussed at the last meeting of the Subcommittee on Improving Air Quality (the Subcommittee) on 16 April 2012, the Chairman invited Ms Audrey EU, Chairman of the Subcommittee, to brief members on the latest progress. Ms Audrey EU said that the subject was discussed in the context of the review of Air Quality Objectives. To facilitate future discussion, the Administration had been requested to provide further information on measures to encourage early replacement of polluting vehicles. As the subject was being followed up by the Subcommittee, members considered it more appropriate for the Subcommittee to continue its work in this respect.

**IV. 272DS – Port Shelter sewerage, stage 2, 273DS – Port Shelter sewerage, stage 3 and 331DS – Outlying Islands sewerage, stage 2 – South Lantau sewerage works**

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1594/11-12(03) — Administration's paper on **272DS** – Port Shelter sewerage, stage 2, **273DS** – Port Shelter sewerage, stage 3 and **331DS** – Outlying Islands sewerage, stage 2 – South Lantau sewerage works)

6. The Assistant Director of Drainage Services (Projects and Development) (ADDS(PD)) gave a power-point presentation on the proposals to part-upgrade "272DS – Port Shelter sewerage, stage 2", "273DS – Port Shelter sewerage, stage 3", and "331DS – Outlying Islands sewerage, stage 2 – South Lantau

sewerage works" to Category A.

*(Post-meeting note: A set of the power-point presentation materials was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(1) 1670/11-12(01) on 23 April 2012.)*

7. Professor Patrick LAU enquired about the arrangements to connect individual village houses to the public sewerage network, and whether the connection would be carried out and paid by the Administration or the villagers concerned. In any case, he considered it more desirable for the Administration to coordinate the connecting works as owners concerned might not be able to find the right expertise to carry out the works. ADDS(PD) explained that under the existing policy, the Administration was responsible for the laying of public sewers on Government land while owners concerned were required to hire their own contractors to carry out the connecting works which were for private use. To facilitate private connection to the public sewerage network, public sewers were laid in close proximity to village houses. The Environmental Protection Department would then follow up with the owners concerned for them to carry out the connection works.

#### 272DS – Port Shelter sewerage, stage 2

8. While supporting in principle the three sewerage projects, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming said that the village communities were generally concerned about possible delay in the provision of public sewerage in unsewered areas, and would urge for early completion of these projects. Noting that **272DS** would involve acquisition of two private agricultural lots and part of five agricultural lots, he enquired if difficulties were encountered in the process of land acquisition, and the impact on the programme of sewerage projects in the event that objections remained unresolved. The Chief Engineer (Sewerage Projects) (CE(SP)) said that most of the land to be resumed for sewerage construction was either within agricultural lots or along village roads. Hence, the land resumption and clearance would not affect any households or structures. The Administration had all along maintained close liaison with the relevant village representatives to enlist their support. For **272DS**, there was no objection relating to the resumption of all the seven agricultural lots and the Lands Department was proceeding with the remaining land resumption processes. In cases should an objection in respect of the gazetted sewerage scheme be received, ADDS(PD) said the impact on the programme of sewerage projects would depend on whether the objection could be resolved through re-gazettal of an amendment sewerage scheme or whether the case had to be submitted to the Chief Executive-in-Council for a decision. The entire process would take about nine months to complete. Mr CHEUNG was pleased with the progress and he hoped that the projects could be completed on schedule.

**331DS – Outlying Islands sewerage, stage 2 – South Lantau sewerage works**

9. Professor Patrick LAU enquired if there were existing sewage treatment facilities within the vicinity of the six unsewered areas, and whether the proposed sewage treatment works (STW) could be constructed in cavern so that the land earmarked for STW could be used for other purposes. ADDS(PD) explained that at present, sewage from the six unsewered areas was treated and disposed of by means of private on-site treatment facilities (such as septic tanks and soakaway systems) which were ineffective in removing pollutants. Sewage from these areas had been identified as a source of water pollution to the receiving waters. Therefore, the provision of public sewerage for the collection, conveyance, treatment and disposal of sewage generated from these areas was necessary as a long-term measure to better protect the water quality. As regards the construction of STW in cavern, ADDS(PD) said that this would depend on many factors, including the presence of nearby mountain suitable for forming caverns. A separate study on the long-term strategy for cavern development would be conducted by the Administration.

10. In concluding, the Chairman said that members did not raise objection to the submission of the proposals to the Public Works Subcommittee.

**V. Environmental impact assessment on the third runway project**

(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1647/11-12(01) — Joint submission from Clean Air Action Group, The Conservancy Association, Friends of the Earth (HK), Hong Kong Dolphin Conservation Society, Greenpeace, Greeners Action, Green Power, Green Sense, and WWF Hong Kong

LC Paper No. CB(1) 1647/11-12(02) — Joint submission from WWF Hong Kong, Friends of the Earth (HK) and Greenpeace)

11. The Chairman said that the subject was included for discussion at the request of environmental groups in the light of concerns about the environmental impacts associated with the development of the three-runway system under the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) Master Plan 2030 (the Master Plan).

Meeting with WWF Hong Kong (WWF)

12. Dr William YU, Acting Deputy Director of Conservation, emphasized the need to conduct social return on investment (SROI) assessment and strategic environment assessment (SEA) before the environmental impact assessment (EIA) to ascertain the social and environmental costs associated with the three-runway system given the scale of the project. Referring to WWF's map of threat to Chinese White Dolphins tabled at the meeting which illustrated the irreparable damage to the ecologically sensitive water on the western side of Hong Kong as a result of the cumulative impact of construction/reclamation projects, Dr YU pointed out that this had indeed affected the survival of Chinese White Dolphins. According to the findings of the public poll (jointly commissioned by WWF and Green Peace) conducted by the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong, 73% of respondents considered it necessary for the Administration to take account of the environmental and social costs in considering the third runway project, which seemed to have been left out in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study to be conducted. WWF estimated that the total carbon tax to be imposed on Asia-Pacific flights alone from the third runway could range up to HK\$59 billion over the next 20 years.

Meeting with Greeners Action (GA)

13. Ms YIP Chui-man, Senior Project Officer, said that GA had all along advocated sustainable development for Hong Kong. Given the involvement of the Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK) in the Master Plan, it was not appropriate for AAHK to conduct the public consultation on the Master Plan which only focused on the economic benefits of the three-runway system without explaining the health, social and environmental costs concerned. While there was general support for the project per se, environmental groups were gravely concerned about issues, including air pollution, marine conservation and noise nuisances, associated with the project. It was disappointed that AAHK had not taken heed of these issues, and that the Master Plan was accepted soon after the consultation exercise was completed. In view of the high cost of \$130 billion and the proposed scale of reclamation of some 650 hectares of the third runway project, there should be inter-departmental participation in the planning and development of the project. The Administration should also take the lead in conducting SEA which should not only focus on the third runway, but also the cumulative impact of the long-term development of Lantau (including the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao-Bridge (HZMB) to be completed in 2016 and the proposed Integrated Waste Management Facilities (IWMF)). She said that GA would not support the EIA for the third runway without conducting the SEA concerned.

Meeting with Hong Kong Dolphin Conservation Society (HKDCS)

14. Dr Samuel HUNG, Chairman, said that HKDCS had been monitoring the Chinese White Dolphins and their habitats over the past 15 years. HKDCS's latest findings revealed that the number of surviving Chinese White Dolphins had been declining possibly due to the deteriorating environment as a result of water and noise pollution caused by the busy marine traffic and construction projects nearby, particularly reclamation works. Given that there were already on-going infrastructural works (such as the construction of HZMB and the road connection works at Chek Lap Kok), the proposed development of the third runway and the associated reclamation of 650 hectares of land would further exacerbate the situation, the cumulative impact of which would indeed affect the survival of Chinese White Dolphins. He urged the Administration to be prudent in planning the third runway, and to conduct an independent SEA on the entire development of Lantau in the longer term.

Meeting with Friends of the Earth (HK) (FOE)  
(LC Paper No. CB(1) 1647/11-12(03))

15. Mr Thomas CHOI, Senior Environmental Affairs Officer, expressed grave dissatisfaction at the non-attendance of the Secretary for the Environment at meetings to discuss the third runway project and its environmental impacts. Besides, more interested parties should have been invited to attend the current meeting to express their views. He also questioned the need for the development of a third runway to attract more people to Hong Kong on economic ground, which in his view might not be sustainable in the long run as Hong Kong was already a densely populated city. Instead of relying on reclamation to provide for more land, long-term planning should be mapped out on the future development of Hong Kong. Given that Tung Chung would be exposed to excessive pollution with the increase in population and the cumulative impact of the many construction projects in the area, he considered it necessary for the Administration to conduct a SEA in addition to the EIA on the third runway project.

Meeting with Green Sense (GS)

16. Ms HO Ka-po, Project Manager, held the view that the questionnaires used by AAHK for the public consultation exercise on the Master Plan were designed with a view to achieving the target result. For instance, the questionnaire lacked information or comparison between the options of maintaining the existing two-runway system and expanding it into a three-runway system. The Master Plan had focused on the economic benefits of the third runway without explaining the associated health and environmental costs. Besides, the questionnaires were mainly distributed within HKIA and hence the views collected might not represent those of the general public. She

concluded that the Administration should take the lead in conducting a SEA to take account of the cumulative impact arising from the many on-going infrastructural developments in Lantau.

#### Meeting with The Conservancy Association (CA)

17. Mr NG Hei-man, Senior Campaign Officer, said that the development of the third runway would indeed aggravate the cumulative impact of the many on-going infrastructural projects on the surrounding environment of Lantau, which was highly unacceptable. He emphasized that a SEA should be conducted before a decision was made on the need for a third runway, and that it should be the Administration, rather than AAHK as the project proponent, to take the lead in conducting the SEA concerned. Apart from economic considerations, the environmental costs of the project should also be taken into account as not all environmental impacts could be mitigated.

#### Meeting with Clean Air Network (CAN)

18. Ms CHAN Fong-ying, Campaign Manager, said that CAN was concerned about the pollution problem, particularly in Tung Chung, as result of the development of the third runway. According to the recent studies conducted in January and February 2012, the level of respiratory suspended particulates smaller than 2.5 microns (PM2.5) in the Tung Chung area was very high and was comparable to that of the busy corridors in Causeway Bay. In fact, the level of PM2.5 in Tung Chung had exceeded the limits under the World Health Organization Air Quality Guidelines. The development of yet another major infrastructural project such as the third runway in Tung Chung would inevitably exacerbate the pollution problem.

#### Meeting with the Administration

19. The Chief Executive Officer/AAHK (CEO/AAHK) said that AAHK launched a three-month public consultation exercise on the Master Plan in June 2011 to seek public views on the future development of HKIA. The Master Plan set out the two proposed development options for respondents to indicate their preferences based on air connectivity, service quality, competitiveness, economic growth, creation of jobs, convenience for travel, environmental impact and construction cost. On the basis of the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the views received, there was a clear majority support for the three-way option as the future development option for HKIA for planning purposes. With the in-principle approval by the Chief Executive in Council, AAHK would proceed with the planning related to the development of the three-runway option, and the work would involve the statutory EIA, the associated design details, and the financial arrangements. As a next step, AAHK would maintain close liaison with environmental groups in taking

forward the statutory EIA process. Upon completion of the planning work, AAHK would report to the Administration which would make a final decision on whether to proceed with the development of the three-runway system taking into account the relevant inputs available.

20. The Executive Director, Corporate Development/AAHK (ED,CD/AAHK) supplemented that the questionnaires were jointly designed by the Social Science Research Centre (SSRC) of The University of Hong Kong and AAHK to facilitate the collection of views. These questionnaires were distributed to members of the public along with the information pamphlets on the future development of HKIA through public exhibitions and about 200 briefings organized either by AAHK or third parties for members of the public, professional groups and interested parties. During the consultation period, about 30 000 questionnaires were received. Of these, 12 500 were collected at HKIA in which 5 500 did not provide residential district information and were not included for analysis. To ensure a fair and impartial process in the compilation of public opinion, AAHK appointed SSRC to independently compile, analyze and report on the views collected during the public consultation exercise.

#### *Environmental impact assessment*

21. Given the many infrastructural projects being/to be carried out at Lantau, notably HZMB and the proposed IWMF, Ms Audrey EU supported that an EIA on the cumulative impact rather than the standalone effect of the third runway project should be conducted. She enquired about the stance of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) in this respect, and the means through which the EIA process should be conducted if it was decided that the cumulative impact of the third runway project should be taken into account rather than a standalone impact of the project. The Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment) (ADEP(EA)) said that under the existing EIA regime, the cumulative impact of a designated project as well as other development projects in the vicinity on marine ecology, fishery, noise, air quality and any other key environmental issues identified would be taken into account. The EIA authority required that project proponents should adequately identify mitigation measures in the EIA process to minimize the potential environment impact.

22. Ms Audrey EU enquired if environmental groups were prepared to accept the three-runway system if the associated environmental impact, in particular on the survival of Chinese White Dolphins, had been properly assessed and effectively mitigated. Dr Samuel HUNG/Hong Kong Dolphin Conservation Society pointed out that the EIA process could not resolve all environmental problems, particularly the cumulative impact which was difficult to quantify. As not all environment impact could be mitigated, there

was a need for a scientific and objective approach to assess the threshold for tolerance of the environmental impact of development projects. By way of illustration, there were no mitigating or compensatory measures identified for the proposed reclamation of 650 hectares under the three-runway system to minimize its impact on the Chinese White Dolphins given the magnitude of reclamation. He opined that it would not be easy for AAHK to obtain approval under the EIA process, and that a review of the planning for the three-runway system should be made.

23. Through the chair, ADEP(EA) said that the impact of the proposed reclamation of 650 hectares under the three-runway system on marine ecology, particularly on the survival of Chinese White Dolphins would be a key issue to be assessed in the EIA study. The proposed reclamation had to meet all the statutory requirements before considered acceptable under the EIA process. The Deputy Secretary for Transport & Housing (Transport) (DSTH(T)) said that the EIA on the three-runway system would not only focus on its standalone impact but also the cumulative impact arising from development projects in the vicinity. As the project proponent, AAHK was responsible for undertaking the statutory EIA process, as well as working out the design details and financial arrangements for the third runway project. The Administration would then decide on whether to proceed with the implementation of the three-runway system when the relevant inputs were available. There would be dialogue with environmental groups during the EIA process on the three-runway system.

*Need for strategic environment assessment/social return on investment assessment/carbon audit*

24. Given the scale of the third runway project and the cumulative impact of other infrastructural projects at Lantau, Ms Audrey EU enquired if the Administration would conduct a SEA in addition to the EIA to be conducted by AAHK. She pointed out that SEA had been conducted as part of the studies on biodiversity. Her views were shared by Miss Tanya CHAN. ADEP(EA) said that SEA was for strategic land use planning studies on a large scale, such as the Kai Tak Development and the North East New Territories Development. The EIA Ordinance (Cap. 499) (EIAO) had already stated the criteria for requiring SEA for land use planning studies. For designated projects, though different in name from SEA for land planning studies, EIA would adopt the same objective standards and would be similarly required to assess the cumulative impacts of other development projects in the vicinity. To better protect the environment, efforts were being made to tighten the objective standards. An example was the new Air Quality Objectives (AQOs) being pursued.

25. Through the chair, Mr Thomas CHOI/FOE stressed that SEA should be conducted by the Administration rather than AAHK given the far-reaching implications of the third runway project on the future development of Hong Kong and its cumulative impact on the environment. Ms HO Ka-po/GS supported the need for a SEA to provide more information on the social and environmental costs of the third runway project before commencing the EIA process, without which GS would have reservations on the project. Mr NG Hei-man/CA echoed that the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) should conduct a SEA to take account of the cumulative impact of the many development projects at Lantau. Ms YIP Chui-man/GA also urged THB to conduct a SEA before AAHK submitted the project profile on the three-runway system.

26. Mr KAM Nai-wai enquired if the Administration would conduct a carbon audit and a SROI assessment on the third runway project, the latter of which would take into account the social and environmental costs associated with the project. He also asked whether mitigation and compensatory measures could be put in place now to mitigate and reduce the impact of the on-going and proposed development projects on the marine environment of Lantau. DSTH(T) said that the statutory EIA was accepted worldwide as a reliable means to assess environmental impact. Besides, there were no internationally accepted guidelines on how SEA and SROI assessment could be conducted. ADEP(EA) added that EPD was required under the EIAO to scrutinize all designated projects, including those related to airport expansion. In order not to jeopardize EPD's position and to maintain its impartiality in the EIA process, it was not appropriate for EPD to make any comments on the Master Plan at this stage. In accordance with EIAO, AAHK was required to conduct an EIA on the third runway project. However, there were no statutory requirements for a SROI assessment or a carbon audit under EIAO. As carbon audit would help provide a basis for formulating measures to reduce carbon emissions, EPD would welcome project proponents to conduct relevant studies and collect data for their designated projects, and would endeavour to provide guidelines in this respect.

27. CEO/AAHK said that as the project proponent, AAHK would comply with EIAO to conduct the statutory EIA on the third runway project to assess the environmental impacts of the project and to identify adequate mitigation measures. With the announcement of the Administration's decision to update AQOs, AAHK had undertaken that a detailed air quality impact assessment would be conducted under the EIA studies using the new AQOs as the benchmark. The Executive Director, Airport Operations/AAHK (ED,AO/AAHK) added that AAHK had put in place a three-year rolling environmental protection programme to reduce emissions, conserve energy and recycle waste. These included the early replacement of old vehicles with hybrid and electric vehicles, tree planting and recycling measures. Given that

an EIA could not address all the environmental concerns, Mr KAM Nai-wai urged AAHK to conduct a carbon audit and a SROI assessment on the three-runway system to assess the associated social and environmental costs. In reply to Mr KAM's further enquiry on the feasibility of having an independent third party to monitoring the EIA process, CEO/AAHK said that it was AAHK's intention to engage an independent third party to advise on the conduct of EIA.

28. Ms Miriam LAU declared that she was a member of AAHK. While acknowledging that the third runway project was of vital importance to the economic development of Hong Kong, she stressed that this should not compromise the environment. There was a need to strike a balance between economic benefits and environmental protection in taking forward the third runway project. AAHK should communicate with environmental groups to work out acceptable solutions to address issues such as protection of the Chinese White Dolphins and impact on air quality. CEO/AAHK said that under the statutory EIA process, there would be two rounds of public consultation through which members of the public could submit their views on the third runway project. Given the scale of the project, AAHK planned to set up focus groups to tackle issues relating to the protection of Chinese White Dolphins and impact on air quality etc, and environmental groups would be invited to share their views. Mr Thomas CHOI/FOE said that FOE was concerned that once the three-runway system was approved upon completion of the EIA process, there would not be any channel through which environmental impact could be addressed. Ms CHAN Fong-ying/CAN emphasized the need for AAHK to make available information on the scale and effectiveness of the mitigating measures to be taken.

29. Miss Tanya CHAN enquired if AAHK had consulted environmental groups to address their concerns about the development of the three-runway system. CEO/AAHK affirmed that AAHK had maintained dialogue with environmental groups and a series of forums had been held to exchange views with interested parties, including environmental groups, during the public consultation on the Master Plan. AAHK would welcome participation of environmental groups in the EIA process as members of the focus groups. As regards information on the scale and design of the three-runway system, CEO/AAHK said that a preliminary design of the three-runway system had been included in the Master Plan while a project profile would be provided to EPD before commencement of the EIA process. A meeting with environmental groups would be held before submission of the project profile to EPD by AAHK in mid 2012.

### Motion

30. Mr KAM Nai-wai proposed and Ms Cyd HO seconded the following

motion -

"That this Panel demands the Airport Authority Hong Kong to conduct environmental studies on the third runway project, including Strategic Environmental Assessment, Social Return on Investment and Carbon Audit, in order to protect the environment of Hong Kong and the areas in its vicinity."

31. The Chairman put the motion to vote. All members present voted for the motion. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

**VI. Any other business**

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

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
25 May 2012