

From: **Peter Reid**

Date: 5 May 2014 17:13

Subject: Public Works Sub-Committee Meeting on May 7 2014 - Submission of Objection =s to the Proposed Public Works of (i) Mega Incinerator and (ii) Landfill Extensions to the WENT and SENT Landfills

To: wklo@engineer.com, lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk, jkstolegco@gmail.com, CHAN KAM LAM <klclegco@gmail.com>, elau@dphk.org, yctam@dab.org.hk, arazack@netvigator.com, khwong@ftulegco.org.hk, Cyd HO <info@cydho.org.hk>, garychk@dab.org.hk, leungkl@leungkl.org, ipkh@dab.org.hk, contact@alanleong.net, albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk, legco@michaeltien.hk, tpc@jamestien.com, frankieyick@liberal.org.hk, Chiwai Wu <chiwaioffice@gmail.com>, 范國威議員辦事處 <fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com>, FK Ma <fkmaoffice@gmail.com>, charlesmok@charlesmok.hk, Ben Chan <benchanlegco@gmail.com>, info@chankalok.hk, yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk, Alice MAK <amlegco@gmail.com>, info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk, helenawonghk@gmail.com, eq@eqweb.hk, Lai Wan Chiang <chianglaiwan@gmail.com>, office@chungsk.com, info@tonytsewaichuen.com

Dear Sir and Madam,

Please find below our primary detailed objections to the above Specified Government Proposals to be heard at the Public Works Sub-Committee on Wednesday 7 May 2014 in the attached pdf file Public Works Sub-Committee Submission 50514.

Permission is hereby given to use the contents of this file any legal form.

Its main arguments are given below, excluding the table :

(The Zero Waste in 3 Years Solution: All Waste is a Valuable Commercial Resource

Hong Kong's Main Waste Categories, Solutions and Guideline Segment Capex AND Opex Costs

Waste Category Daily Volume Tons District Solution HK\$ Billion Capex Target Opex)

The Real Solution to a Non-Existent Sham Problem - Waste is a Valuable Resource and a Commercial Business

A New Mindset and Thinking is urgently required to solve Hong Kong's purported Waste Problem in a fair, sustainable and cost-effective manner, in a fast-track time implementation period of 3 years or less. Waste must be treated as a valuable commercial resource not as dirty waste.

High cost, unsustainable, long-term and partial non-solutions, proposed by Government and the EPD, are at best unsustainable, irrational and unreasonable i.e. nonsense and contrary to common sense; or at worse smell of a large scale sham charade systemic infrastructure fraud that is being perpetrated on the people of Hong Kong. The Government's focus is on unnecessary, irresponsible and exorbitant large scale Capital Works, like the now proposed for the Mega Incinerator, Landfill Extensions and Biogas Organic Waste Treatment Facilities. Analysis of contract tender procedures and relative costs in Annex 1 shows how the 'shell game' of this well-laid and well-practiced infrastructure fraud works for existing well-

connected vested pecuniary interests. The mechanism is used to plunder public funds beneath a veneer of officialdom, propriety and legitimacy. The works are always essential, urgently needed and subject to public tender, as a matter of course. The reality is in fact the reverse.

Infrastructure works for these proposed projects are measured by the two financial indicators of Capital Expenditure (Capex) and Operating Expenditure (Opex). All the Capex and Opex for the Government's projects are exorbitant, ill defined, unbounded and subject to potential massive future cost rises i.e. just like the fast rail link. Not only are they exorbitant in cost, but also irrelevant, unjustified, damaging to our environment and eco-system, and a threat to health. This is a shocking and appalling combination for a purported partial-solution, not designed to properly address Hong Kong's real waste problems.

The real solution is not profound, unexpected or difficult to understand. Waste in Hong Kong, whether Municipal Solid Waste (MSW), Construction or Hazardous Toxic Chemical Wastes is easy to define and address with proven large scale 'mature' green solutions. These are sustainable, and do not produce 'Carbon to Air' global warming, green house, climate change gases and dangerous air and ground pollutants that are harmful to health. These 'Carbon to Earth' Technologies can address Hong Kong's waste problems in a radical, faster, better and much more cost-effective manner. To produce a 'Think Green Go Clean, Live Cool' Zero Waste Zero Waste Pollution Hong Kong within 3 Years. The 'smoke and mirrors' real cost of change, which the Government has carefully hidden, is the bill for terminating the existing unsustainable long term waste to landfill contracts with the likes of Veolia and Sita.

(Table - The Zero Waste in 3 Years Solution: All Waste is a Valuable Commercial Resource

Hong Kong's Main Waste Categories, Solutions and Guideline Segment Capex AND Opex Costs

**Waste Category Daily Volume Tons District Solution HK\$ Billion
Capex Target Opex**

(% of Total Waste) (Worst Case 20% Contingency)

Totals Recycled 13,000 Tons (100%) Total Capex and Opex HK\$ Billion 42 +12

QED QEF Overall Net ROI 29% Payback period less than 4 years)

Annex 1

Case Study - How the Pork Barrel and Gravy Train to Raid Public Funds Works

Organic Waste Treatment Facility 1 - The Lowest Tender Price HK\$1.53 Billion

A voluminous tender of around 2,700 plus pages, for a low volume 200 tons a day food waste plant, situated in a remote area of North Lantau. The plant is not designed to treat green waste i.e. it is specifically excluded, and can only treat food waste with an ultra high water content specification. This means that the plant is actually dealing with a dehydrated mass of around 40 tons a day of organic matter i.e. HK\$1,530 million for 40 tons a day of organic matter and 160 tons of waste water requiring treatment. The Capex Cost is stupendously high, as is the Opex Cost of HK\$70 million a year. Per ton per day Capex HK\$38.25 million. The plant will generate an undisclosed amount of global warming gases to air, has no notified agreement of any connection to a power utility and will produce unwanted fertiliser. Needless to say the EAP and CWSC Committees approved this Capex with almost no dissent.

This Biogas 'Carbon to Air' Plant is the most expensive in the world by a wide margin i.e. By a Factor of 10 or around 1,000 % at US\$196 million. Comparisons with a number of recently constructed or tendered similar small scale biogas and fertiliser plants in a number of high labour cost economies, give an average price uplift in Hong Kong of 1,000 %. There would appear to be no real rationale behind this con (CON - a lie to the world) green facility and financial extravaganza. Not only is it environmentally unsustainable by producing global warming gases and putting 'Carbon to Air', with an energy loss of around 80%, but it has also inanely designed to produce energy that nobody wants and fertiliser, which from the experience of Cheung Chau, will be unwanted and have to be landfilled.

A direct comparison with proven 'Carbon to Earth' Food and Green Waste Plants in Taiwan is highly instructive and revealing. These food waste plants are modular and deal daily on average, in an 8 hour work day, with 200 to 1,000 tons of food and green waste. They occupy any industrial or agricultural premises of 15,000 to 30,000 sq. ft. No specialist adaptation or safety measures is required for these premises, since the processes are perfectly safe and sanitised. The plants produce high quality fish farm food, liquid and solid fertilisers i.e. to earth To reduce pollution logistics used in the same district where the food and green waste is produced. The abundance of fish farms is testament to their success.

A high tech fish and vegetable farming facility, integrated with a 300 tons a day food waste plant inclusive of water treatment facilities, premises adaptation, testing facilities and hybrid collection vehicles: Total Capex set up and operating is US\$20 million. This includes the high ROI fish farming facilities i.e. 10 % of the Capex of the OWTF 1 for a revenue generating facility. The facility's Opex is actually positive as a fish farm generates high revenues with an average minimum ROI of 150 % net a Year, depending on the mix of fresh and salt water fish species i.e. the facilities Opex is positive as it generates high revenues, compared to a Opex for the OWTF 1, equivalent to the Capex of a Taiwan Food and Green Waste Plant dealing with 50 % more Food Waste only working an 8 hour shift cycle!

A former Chief Engineer of a major construction company has examined the Tender for OWTF Phase 1. He states that a tender of such over complexity could in his opinion only have been produced in conjunction with a 'preferred' bidder. The Tender Board, responding to complaints on this tender of it being overly complex, extremely demanding in requirements and obstructive, has stated that it will now introduce a new procedure to employ a second consultant to examine the tender specification produced by the original consultant! In this case the first consultant would appear to be AECOM, who supplied the original Tender documents. It should be noted that OWTF Phase 2 is also now out to tender.

Note Well - The Capex of OWTF 1 is actually more than Capex to deal with HK's entire food and green waste using Taiwan 'Carbon to Earth.' technologies. OWTF 1 figures used pro-rata for the rest of HK's food and green waste gives a total Capex figure of HK\$38.25

Billion and Annual Opex of HK\$1.26 Billion at current prices! This illustrates the mind boggling scale of the waste infrastructure Capex and Opex misrepresentation, deception and fraud: Waste Mega Pork Barrel Capex and Opex Gravy Train' Literally this is the 'Great Waste Train Robbery.'

The same mechanism is now at work in the Government Incinerator and Landfill extension proposals before the Committee.

1. The proposals are completely unnecessary and deliberately and intentionally proposing the wrong solutions to address the wrong problem. The proposals are simply irrational, perverse and fraudulent.
2. The proposals are ultra expensive engineering and infrastructure works that do not address the identified needs, but instead address the needs of identified vested pecuniary interests. These works are to approved by persons including those with conflicts of interest and even direct connections to the said same vested interests. A truly astonishing position with potentially devastating liability consequences for all concerned parties. Members attention is drawn to House of Lords Decision of *Porter v Magill* [2002] 2 AC 357. Members must be presumed to have full knowledge, information and awareness of their actions and therefore know when illegal acts have been and are being perpetrated and committed. The potential consequences for Hong Kong's global reputation and credibility are again mind boggling, as the Erwana torture case clearly shows.

Hong Kong Waste for Global Warming

Waste sent to incinerators, landfills and waste-to-energy plants, is a major source of global warming gases and chemical air, water and earth pollutants. Organic food and green waste converted to biogas and fuels, exacerbate this harmful pollution while incurring energy losses up to 80 per cent.

These short-sighted solutions convert our so-called waste problem into the extremely dangerous global warming climate change problem, which a recent UN report has said will increase the likelihood of severe, pervasive, and irreversible impacts. This completely avoidable action is perverse and unsustainable, destroying nature, our environment and eco-systems.

The earth is sending its own warnings to us with increasing regularity. Nobel Prize laureate Joseph Stiglitz, told a joke at the recent Macau Eco

conference. There are two planets, one happy and the other unhappy. The happy planet says, "What's wrong?" The unhappy planet says "People". The happy planet laughs and replies, "Don't worry, that's temporary."

Atmospheric research pioneer Ralph Keeling has talked about a "fossil carbon to air" problem. Private and public waste interests – which are inextricably linked – are deliberately blind to the catastrophic consequences of their activities.

Hong Kong's proposed mega-incinerator, landfill extensions, the exorbitant biogas unconnected energy plants producing unwanted fertiliser, and the world's largest sewage quad incinerator now being tested at Tuen Mun, all completely fail the global warming test by putting vast amounts of fossil carbon to air.

Two recent articles in the South China Morning Post referred to Holland's waste rates. The first quoted a recycling rate of 80 per cent, incineration 16 per cent and landfill 4 per cent. The second report gave different figures – recycling 68 per cent, waste to energy 30 per cent and landfill 2 per cent. If local recycling was 68 per cent to 80 per cent, then the direct conclusion is that there would be no need for any landfill extensions. This is clearly confirmed by the negligible Dutch landfill figures.

The European Union has mandated that by 2020 no recyclables and no organic food and green waste can be sent either to incinerators or landfills. This means that Dutch incineration, will be gradually phased out due to the lack of legal feedstock, as will the remaining landfills. Similarly, incineration is not sustainable and poses a threat to our environment. Combustion and landfills must be replaced by planet-friendly comprehensive recycling.

Please help save Hong Kong's environment by going to a comprehensive zero waste plan

Your Sincerely

Peter Reid, Chairman
Zero Waste Smart City Resources Association Ltd.

Attachments:

Public Works Sub-Committee submission 50514 1.pdf

The Real Solution to a Non-Existent Sham Problem-Waste is a Valuable Resource

A New Mindset and Thinking is urgently required to solve Hong Kong's purported Waste Problem in a fair, sustainable and cost-effective manner, in a fast-track time implementation period of 3 years or less. Waste must be treated as a valuable commercial and community resource not as dirty waste.

High cost, unsustainable, long-term and partial non-solutions, proposed by Government and the EPD, are at best unsustainable, irrational and unreasonable i.e. nonsense and contrary to common sense; or at worse smell of a large scale sham charade systemic infrastructure fraud that is being perpetrated on the people of Hong Kong. The Government's focus is on unnecessary, irresponsible and exorbitant large scale Capital Works, like the now proposed for the Mega Incinerator, Landfill Extensions and Biogas Organic Waste Treatment Facilities. Analysis of contract tender procedures and relative costs in Annex 1 shows how the 'shell game' of this well-laid and well-practiced 'infrastructure fraud' works for existing well-connected vested pecuniary interests. The mechanism is used to plunder public funds beneath a veneer of officialdom, propriety and legitimacy. The works are always essential, urgently needed and subject to public tender, as a matter of course. The reality is in fact the reverse.

Infrastructure works for these proposed projects are measured by the two financial indicators of Capital Expenditure (Capex) and Operating Expenditure (Opex). All the Capex and Opex for the Government's projects are exorbitant, ill defined, unbounded and subject to potential massive future cost rises i.e. just like the fast rail link. Not only are they exorbitant in cost, but also irrelevant, unjustified, damaging to our environment and ecosystem, and a threat to the public health of the entire population of Hong Kong. This is a shocking and appalling combination for a purported partial-solution, not designed to properly address Hong Kong's real waste problems.

The real solution is not profound, unexpected or difficult to understand. Waste in Hong Kong, whether Municipal Solid Waste (MSW), Construction or Hazardous Toxic Chemical Wastes is easy to define and address with proven large scale 'mature' green solutions. These are sustainable, and do not produce 'Carbon to Air' global warming, green house, climate change gases together with dangerous air and ground pollutants that are harmful to health. These 'Carbon to Earth' Technologies can address Hong Kong's waste problems in a radical, faster, better and much more cost-effective manner. To produce within 3 years a 'Think Green Go Clean, Live Cool' Zero Waste Zero Waste Pollution Hong Kong. The 'smoke and mirrors' real cost of change, which the Government has carefully hidden, is the Termination Cost for the existing unsustainable long term waste to landfill contracts currently with Veolia and Sita.

The Zero Waste in 3 Years Solution: All Waste as a Valuable Commercial Resource

Hong Kong's Main Waste Categories, Solutions and Guideline Segment				Capex	Opex Costs
Waste Category	Daily Volume Tons (% of Total Waste)	District Solution	HK\$ Billion (Worst Case with 20% Contingency)	Capex	Target Opex
1. Food and Green	6,000 (70% Water) (45%)	Taiwan Modular Food Waste Plants, Integrated Fish & Veg Farms, 600 E-Vans		- 6	+ 9
2. Recyclables	2,500 (20%)	District Single Track Systems with Italy Bar-Code Separation at Source 300 E-Vans		- 9	+ 2
3. Construction	3,500 (25%)	Singapore Recycling Licensing and Basic Aggregates Production		- 9	+ 2
4. Hazardous-Toxic Non-Recyclables	1,000 (7.5%)	2 Non-Incineration Plasma Plants 1 GW Power, Jet Fuel & Glass Aggregates		- 8	+ 2
5. Eco and Recycling Education & Training		The Real Essential Soft Infrastructure for all Students, Households and Workers.		- 10	- 3
Totals Recycled	13,000 Tons (100%)	Total Capex and Net Opex HK\$ Billion		- 42	+12
QED QEF	Overall Net ROI 29% Payback period less than 4 years				

Annex 1

Case Study - How the Pork Barrel and Gravy Train to Raid Public Funds Works

Organic Waste Treatment Facility 1 - The Lowest Tender Price HK\$1.53 Billion

A voluminous tender of around 2,700 plus pages, for a low volume 200 tons a day food waste plant, situated in a remote area of North Lantau. The plant is not designed to treat green waste i.e. it is specifically excluded, and can only treat food waste with an ultra high water content specification. This means that the plant is actually dealing with a dehydrated mass of around 40 tons a day of organic matter i.e. HK\$1,530 million for 40 tons a day of organic matter and 160 tons of waste water requiring treatment. The Capex Cost is stupendously high, as is the Opex Cost of HK\$70 million a year. Per ton per day Capex HK\$38.25 million. The plant will generate an undisclosed amount of global warming gases to air, has no notified agreement of any connection to a power utility and will produce unwanted fertiliser. Needless to say the EAP and CWSC Committees approved this Capex with almost no dissent.

This Biogas 'Carbon to Air' Plant is the most expensive in the world by a wide margin i.e. By a Factor of 10 or around 1,000 % at US\$196 million. Comparisons with a number of recently constructed or tendered similar small scale biogas and fertiliser plants in a number of high labour cost economies, give an average price uplift in Hong Kong of 1,000 %. There would appear to be no real rationale behind this con (CON - a lie to the world) green facility and financial extravaganza. Not only is it environmentally unsustainable by producing global warming gases and putting 'Carbon to Air', with an energy loss of around 80%, but it has also inanely designed to produce energy that nobody wants and fertiliser, which from the experience of Cheung Chau, will be unwanted and have to be sent to landfill.

A direct comparison with proven 'Carbon to Earth' Food and Green Waste Plants in Taiwan is highly instructive and revealing. These food waste plants are modular and deal daily on average, in an 8 hour work day, with 200 to 1,000 tons of food and green waste. They occupy any industrial or agricultural premises of 15,000 to 30,000 sq. ft. No specialist adaptation or safety measures is required for these premises, since the processes are perfectly safe and sanitised. The plants produce high quality fish farm food, liquid and solid fertilisers i.e. to earth To reduce pollution logistics, it is used in the same district where the food and green waste is produced. The abundance of fish farms is testament to their success.

A high tech fish and vegetable farming facility, integrated with a 300 tons a day food waste plant inclusive of water treatment facilities, premises adaptation, testing facilities and hybrid collection vehicles: Total Capex Set-Up and Operating is US\$20 million. This includes the high ROI fish farming facilities i.e. 10 % of the Capex of the OWTT 1 for a revenue generating facility. The facility's Opex is actually positive as a fish farm generates high revenues, with an average minimum ROI of 150 % net a year, depending on the mix of fresh and salt water fish species i.e. the facilities Opex is positive as it generates high revenues, compared to a Negative Opex for the OWTF 1, equivalent to the Capex of a Taiwan Food and Green Waste Plant dealing 300 tons a day 'Carbon to Earth' i.e. with 50 % more Food Waste and only working an 8 hour shift cycle!

A former Chief Engineer of a major construction company has examined the Tender for OWTF Phase 1. He states that a tender of such over complexity could in his opinion only have been per-prepared and produced in conjunction with a 'preferred' bidder. The Tender Board, responding to complaints on this tender of it being overly complex, extremely demanding in requirements and obstructive, has stated that it will now introduce a new procedure to employ a second consultant to examine the tender specification produced by the original consultant! In this case the first consultant would appear to be AECOM, who supplied the original Tender documents. It should be noted that OWTF Phase 2 is also now out to tender. The extremely rigorous specification requirements are again present.

Note Well - The Capex of OWTF 1 is actually more than Capex to deal with HK's entire food and green waste using Taiwan 'Carbon to Earth.' technologies. OWTF 1 figures used pro-rata for the rest of HK's food and green waste gives a total Capex figure of HK\$38.25 Billion and Annual Opex of HK\$1.26 Billion, at current prices, for dealing with HK's entire organic food and green waste! This illustrates the mind boggling scale of the waste infrastructure Capex and Opex misrepresentation, deception and fraud: A Waste Mega Pork Barrel Capex and Opex Gravy Train This is the 'Great Waste Train Robbery.'

The same mechanism is now at work in the Government Incinerator and Landfill extension proposals before the Public Works Sub- Committee. The largest sewage incinerator in the world, now under test, raises the same issues and the fundamental question why was it built at all?

1. The proposals are completely unnecessary and deliberately and intentionally proposing the wrong solutions to address the wrong problem. The proposals are simply irrational, perverse and fraudulent.
2. The proposals are ultra expensive engineering and infrastructure works that do not address the identified needs, but instead address the needs of identified vested pecuniary interests. These works are to approved by persons including those with conflicts of interest and even direct connections to the said same vested interests. A truly astonishing position with potentially devastating liability consequences for all concerned parties. Members attention is drawn to House of Lords Decision of **Porter v Magill** [2002] 2 AC 357.
3. Members must be presumed to have full knowledge, information and awareness of their actions and therefore know when illegal acts have been and are being perpetrated and committed. The potential consequences for Hong Kong's global reputation and credibility are again mind boggling, as the Erwiana torture case clearly shows.

致特區政府及各議員:

商討擴建將軍澳堆填區之前，環境局可有做好以下 10 件事?

1. 履行落區承諾，收集受影響居民意見

去年政府擴建計劃「觸礁」後，政府曾公開承諾落區收集居民意見。唯黃錦星只到過屯門及元朗兩區，卻從未到過「最受堆填區影響」的將軍澳。去年 9 月，黃錦星更與西貢區議會閉門會議，禁止市民、傳媒旁聽，甚至阻止反擴堆填區的區議員進場開會。

我們是最受害的一群，堆填區深深影響我及家人的健康。我們要求擴建計劃放上立法會之前，環境局局長黃錦星必須履行承諾，落區與將軍澳居民接觸及商討改善措施。

2. 落實新界東南堆填區關閉的時間表

環境局在新界東南堆填區操作年期上多次「亂估」:

- ◆ 2004 年西貢區議會文件 SKDC(M)18/04-05，環境運輸及工務局廖秀冬年代指堆填區於 2011 年滿溢；
- ◆ 2005 年環境局的環評報告(合約編號:CE10/2005EP)，指堆填區於 2012 年停止接收廢物；
- ◆ 2006 年立法會文件 IN37/05-06，同樣是環境運輸及工務局廖秀冬年代指堆填區的操作至 2007 年完成；
- ◆ 2008 年立法會文件 CB(1) 88/08-09(06)，環境局邱騰華年代指堆填區於 2012 年至 2013 年滿溢；
- ◆ 2014 年立法會文件 CB1/SS/6/13，環境局黃錦星指堆填區於 2015 年尾滿溢。

作為一個政策局，環境局在計算堆填區操作年期上毫不專業、甚為兒戲，多次令將軍澳居民出現錯誤期望。由於多次被欺騙，我們對環境局再次預計擴建後的新界東南堆填區使用壽命會延至 2020 年表示「極度懷疑」，我們要求環境局向公眾交代確實關閉時間表，並刊登憲報確認。

3. 改善進出堆填區的泥頭垃圾車所帶來的交通、環境、衛生問題

現時，環保大道是出入將軍澳多個屋苑、工業邨及堆填區的唯一通道，每天進出堆填區及填料庫的泥頭垃圾車多達 4 千部，引致環境及空氣嚴重污染、塵土飛揚、路面險象橫生，懸浮粒子 PM2.5 更嚴重超標。因此，唯有終極關閉堆填區、或所有垃圾透過水路運送至堆填區，才能徹底解決泥頭垃圾車造成的問題。

為此，我們要求環境局安排以水路形式運送所有至堆填區的垃圾。若環境局向受影響居民釋出誠意、處理好以上問題後，屆時我們會考慮與局方商討堆填區計劃。

4. 廣泛獲得地區共識及支持

早於 2010 年西貢區議會已跨黨派及獨立議員通過動議「政府在未能解決臭味、交通、環境衛生問題，及未能在將軍澳所有屋苑全面諮詢，獲得居民支持前，本會堅決反對新界東南堆填區之擴建計劃」(文件 SKDC(M)116/08 號)。但環境局卻多次對外訛稱，指 2011 年 5 月 3 日西貢區議會上大部分區議員均支持或不反對堆填區擴建。事實上，西貢區議會從未議決支持擴建方案。

相反，城市規劃委員會曾於 2011 年就新界東南堆填區(將軍澳分區計劃大綱草圖編號 S/TKO/18)諮詢公眾，結果收集到 2 千多項反對意見。由此可見，新界東南堆填區擴建方案從未獲地區的支持或共識。我們要求環境局就擴建方案先於將軍澳區作全面諮詢。

5. 支助將軍澳屋苑回收及改善配套

由於長年受堆填區問題滋擾，將軍澳居民有極高的環保意識，早已養成回收習慣。將軍澳多個屋苑早已推行各種有分類的回收計劃，如廚餘、廢紙、金屬、玻璃樽等，成效顯著。唯環境局對區內屋苑回收支援不足，「屋苑廚餘循環再造項目」成效不彰，「社區回收推廣車先導計劃」斷樞禾蟲。居民雖有心響應，但回收無以為繼。

事實上，將軍澳屋苑絕對願意帶頭回收減廢，唯政府對屋苑回收可謂「零」支援，現時多個屋苑(如將軍澳中心)只靠自發回收廚餘。我們要求環境局在徵收垃圾費、推出堆填區擴建之前，先統籌全港屋苑的回收計劃，並把將軍澳納入試點之一。

6. 沼氣轉煤氣立即上馬

早於 2009 年，政府已完成跟煤氣公司討論，把新界東南堆填區的沼氣淨化用作生產煤氣之用。此舉可將堆填區沼氣轉為有用的能源，同時可減少空氣污染物。至今已 5 年時間，但目前堆填區依然 24 小時燃燒沼氣，區內居民飽受堆填區所排放的二氧化碳、硫化氫和碳氫化合物等氣體之苦。

我們要求環境局在推出擴建方案之前，應先處理好區內原有堆填區的排放沼氣問題，立即把堆填區的沼氣轉為有用能源，惠及香港市民。

7. 環評落後，要求重新評估

新界東南堆填區擴建計劃的環評報告於 2005 年進行時，附近還未有民居，直至 2009 年始有居民陸續遷入。現時，鄰近的 85、86 區已發展了近 10000 個住宅單位，居住人口還不斷增加。2005 年的環評報告中所指的「輕微」影響早已不合實際，將軍澳堆填區及 137 填料庫運作帶來的污染、臭味對附近居民的實際影響比當時的環境評估大得多。

所有政府的大型工程上馬，必須製作與時並進且公正的環評報告。鑑於現時將軍澳 85 區、86 區的情況與 2005 年時截然不同，我們要求環境局不要自欺欺人，重做的新界東南堆填區環評報告。

8. 完善建築物廢料收費

近年大型基建項目、公共房屋陸續興建，令建築廢料大增。然而，政府對公私營的基建工程所製造的建築物廢料均無規管，對新界東南堆填區造成沉重壓力。

去年，政府妄顧西貢區議會及市民的強烈反對，「霸王硬上弓」把 137 填料庫的運作延期至 2018 年。加上環境局計劃於擴建建築垃圾的堆填區，導致現時新界東南堆填區及 137 填料庫處理全港近 70% 的建築廢料。運載廢料的重型車對區內交通幹道的衛生和安全構成沉重壓力，路面不時出現凹陷情況，釘板泥頭周街跌。將軍澳隧道每日車流量已達 9 萬架次，設計上限為 7.8 萬架次，遠超負荷。

建築廢物處置收費已多年(自 2006 年)沒有調整，加上本港的收費水平比其他國家訂立為低，因此調高收費、加強監管是必須的。我們要求環境局完善建築物廢料收費政策，減少堆填區的沉重壓力。

9. 防止循環再造物料運送往堆填區

政府的減廢回收工作相當被動，在各方經年累月爭取下，當局方於今年 1 月擴大玻璃樽回收試行範圍，但未見推廣至全港的決心，還有大量玻璃樽需堆填處理。另外，建築廢料早應實行回收，木材、金屬製品、玻璃窗均可回收再造。現時可循環再造的物料以堆填處理，不單佔用了大量堆填空間、且浪費珍貴資源。

10. 政府部門帶頭採用循環再造物料

要確保本地環保及循環再造業可持續發展，政府應帶動整個社會使用循環再造物料的風氣，所有政府部門牽頭採用更多環保及循環再造產品，從而推動其市場發展，令再造產品有價。在所有新的公共工程、政府建築物及公共屋邨，我們要求政府普及使用循環再造物料，起示範作用。

總結

全港三個策略性堆填區之中，新界東南堆填區最接近民居，距將軍澳工業邨(TVB 電視城、壹傳媒、香港電視等)更只有一街之隔，嚴重影居民健康，更為醫療系統帶來沉重負擔。將軍澳居民為香港整體利益，已肩起處理全港垃圾三十多年的責任。即使政府推出擴建計劃，我們也並不是盲目反對，而是「舊債未清，新債免問」。我們要求在商討擴建之前，政府必先妥善處理堆填區引伸出來的一連串問題。

在此促請全體立法會議員，請監督政府在民生議題上行駛「應有之義」，促使環境局先做好以上 10 件事，展示政府解決問題的決心後，才商討擴建新界東南堆填區的申請。

第六屆都會駅住宅業主小組委員會

張展鵬主席

2014 年 5 月 5 日



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25	MD	37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	OSCAR C
7		19		31		43	CLARENCE
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	Dany Wong
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35	TYCUS	47	
12		24		36	ABBIE	48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區












































COPY


	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	

請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28	Adrian	40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18	方凱仁	30		42	MT
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	LSN
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25	Kyle Zuh	37	Chun-shing
2		14		26	Andy Zuh	38	
3	P. K. Ho	15	Lee	27	Fiona Yip	39	陳明基
4		16		28	Yenn Yip	40	劉博海
5		17		29		41	彭海濤
6	Louise	18		30		42	周瑞佳
7		19		31	何小姐	43	沈志雄
8		20		32	Dany	44	曾嘉樂
9		21	Chen	33	Simon	45	
10	Patty Lee	22	李基偉	34	梁卓輝	46	Aaron Sin
11	Long Fook	23	呂曉輝	35		47	
12		24	Lu-yu Lai	36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26	Ma Wai-gi	38	
3		15		27	IVAN	39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18	Chan Siu Chun	30		42	
7		19		31	Jacob Chung	43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21	Chan Joo-fa	33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23	Li Ng	35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Nandy	13	[Signature]	25	[Signature]	37	[Signature]
2	[Signature]	14	Edwin	26	[Signature]	38	[Signature]
3	Renee	15	JASON	27	CSA	39	J.
4	[Signature]	16	[Signature]	28	[Signature]	40	[Signature]
5	[Signature]	17	Wai Hong	29	[Signature]	41	[Signature]
6	[Signature]	18	J. Kim	30	[Signature]	42	Chen
7	[Signature]	19	[Signature]	31	[Signature]	43	Peter
8	[Signature]	20	[Signature]	32	[Signature]	44	[Signature]
9	[Signature]	21	[Signature]	33	[Signature]	45	[Signature]
10	[Signature]	22	[Signature]	34	[Signature]	46	[Signature]
11	[Signature]	23	[Signature]	35	[Signature]	47	[Signature]
12	[Signature]	24	[Signature]	36	[Signature]	48	[Signature]



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2	kelek	14	Wendy	26	Candy	38	
3	thomas	15	陳桂琼	27		39	
4		16		28	Jan	40	
5		17	Chane	29		41	
6		18	Han Lan May	30	Mandy	42	黃美芝
7	Alvin	19	fuck	31	PK	43	
8	Alan	20		32	Just	44	
9		21	Jack	33	Oliver	45	
10		22	Elke	34	Kenneth	46	
11	Qui	23	King	35	Samuel	47	Ho
12	St.	24		36	Lex	48	




請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	May	25	Joseph	37	M. L. L.
2		14	Y. S.	26	Chang J. L.	38	M. L.
3	A. L.	15	Sharon	27	M. L.	39	S. L.
4	M. L.	16	Myron	28	C. L.	40	F. L.
5	S. L.	17	Anita	29	F. L.	41	R. L.
6	T. L.	18	Y. L.	30	C. L.	42	Shi Chao
7	Cheng	19	Chapman	31	W. L.	43	Monica L.
8	L. L.	20	M. L.	32	M. L.	44	廖輝
9	Y. L.	21	M. L.	33	M. L.	45	Y. L.
10	P. L.	22	L. L.	34	L. L.	46	L. L.
11	L. L.	23	M. L.	35	M. L.	47	W. L.
12	Anthony	24	廖輝	36	Cheng	48	L. L.



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Lam	13	Ryan	25	[Signature]	37	易月梅
2	朱頌盈 Chu Cheuk Ying	14	Shit	26	[Signature]	38	[Signature]
3	Kittang	15	bach	27	[Signature]	39	[Signature]
4	Carol	16	[Signature]	28	Fred	40	Marking
5	[Signature]	17	Jan	29	Steven	41	[Signature]
6	Uen	18	Tom	30	[Signature]	42	[Signature]
7	[Signature]	19	Zala	31	[Signature]	43	[Signature]
8	Indi	20	Alan	32	[Signature]	44	Donde
9	[Signature]	21	Aam	33	[Signature]	45	Shun
10	[Signature]	22	Apple	34	黃惠潔	46	Amey
11	Helen	23	[Signature]	35	Chris	47	[Signature]
12	Lober	24	King	36	[Signature]	48	[Signature]



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Kelly	25		37	SLAN
2		14		26	Pam	38	Wilsa
3	Leo S	15		27		39	Mw
4	M. W. King	16	Richard	28	Chun	40	
5		17	Chan Lai Chi	29		41	
6		18	Wing	30		42	高長
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33	Sunny So	45	
10	林好	22		34	Mary Liu	46	
11		23	Per	35	So	47	
12		24	3res	36	Daniel	48	Noris Chan



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	R. Wan	13	Zakaria	25	[Signature]	37	[Signature]
2	H. Wan	14	Saucho	26	[Signature]	38	wang
3	Re Cheng	15	L.C.	27	[Signature]	39	[Signature]
4	[Signature]	16	[Signature]	28	[Signature]	40	吳耀耀
5	Angling	17	[Signature]	29	[Signature]	41	[Signature]
6	HAN	18	[Signature]	30	[Signature]	42	[Signature]
7	Jace	19	[Signature]	31	[Signature]	43	[Signature]
8	[Signature]	20	李麗	32	[Signature]	44	[Signature]
9	[Signature]	21	[Signature]	33	[Signature]	45	[Signature]
10	[Signature]	22	[Signature]	34	hoi	46	[Signature]
11	[Signature]	23	Tom Chan	35	Cherry	47	[Signature]
12	[Signature]	24	[Signature]	36	[Signature]	48	[Signature]



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	譚卓兒
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	David
5		17		29		41	Chen
6		18		30		42	ephone
7		19		31		43	曾艷
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Wily L2	13	[Signature]	25	[Signature]	37	[Signature]
2	Robert Chen	14	[Signature]	26	Nan	38	[Signature]
3	[Signature]	15	[Signature]	27	Lawrence	39	[Signature]
4	[Signature]	16	[Signature]	28	[Signature]	40	[Signature]
5	[Signature]	17	[Signature]	29	[Signature]	41	[Signature]
6	[Signature]	18	Woon Kip	30	[Signature]	42	[Signature]
7	[Signature]	19	N. H. Ho	31	[Signature]	43	[Signature]
8	[Signature]	20	[Signature]	32	[Signature]	44	[Signature]
9	[Signature]	21	[Signature]	33	[Signature]	45	[Signature]
10	[Signature]	22	[Signature]	34	NING	46	[Signature]
11	[Signature]	23	[Signature]	35	[Signature]	47	CARON
12	[Signature]	24	[Signature]	36	Frankie	48	Donia



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Wing	13		25		37	
2		14		26	黃鏡光	38	
3	ching	15		27	文	39	
4		16	白永琪	28		40	
5	C. S. Lam	17		29		41	
6	張	18		30		42	
7	S. P. Wong	19		31		43	
8	Mr. Kim	20		32		44	
9	Stanley	21		33		45	
10	Edith	22		34		46	
11	Sen	23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Joseph	25		37	Chester
2		14	Grace	26		38	Alex
3		15	Ng Wei Ch	27		39	Archie
4		16	S. K. H.	28		40	May
5		17	Queenie	29		41	Joe
6		18	Ann	30		42	John
7		19	Dennis	31		43	John
8	Candy	20	W. W.	32		44	John
9		21	W. W.	33		45	John
10		22	Lei	34		46	John
11		23	張生	35		47	John
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Quemir	13	Pun	25	Le	37	Chen
2	K. Chan	14	Chen	26	黃有霞	38	Ng
3	Chan Pich	15	Chen	27	劉振強	39	Chen
4	Chen	16	Chen	28	Chen	40	Chen
5	Chen	17	Chen	29	Chen	41	Chen
6	Chen	18	Chen	30	Wong	42	Chen
7	Chen	19	Chen	31	Chen	43	Chen
8	Chen	20	Chen	32	Chen	44	Chen
9	Chen	21	Chen	33	Chen	45	Chen
10	Chen	22	Chen	34	Chen	46	Chen
11	Chen	23	Chen	35	Chen	47	Chen
12	Chen	24	Chen	36	Chen	48	Chen



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12	Ma vis	24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Bernice	25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7	陳.	19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21	D Gramman	33		45	
10		22		34	Tomy & Tan Sham	46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24	Wini	36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

簽署	簽署	簽署	簽署
1	13	25	37
2	14	26	38
3	15	27	39
4	16	28	40
5	17	29	41
6	18	30	42
7	19	31	43
8	20	32	44
9	21	33	45
10	22	34	46
11	23	35	47
12	24	36	48



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

簽署	簽署	簽署	簽署
1	13	25	37
2	14	26	38
3	15	27	39
4	16	28	40
5	17	29	41
6	18	30	42
7	19	31	43
8	20	32	44
9	21	33	45
10	22	34	46
11	23	35	47
12	24	36	48



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Chan	25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	W.H.
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	HL	13	Lig Ling	25	Handwritten	37	Handwritten
2	Mu	14	Handwritten	26	Way Way	38	Handwritten
3	Que	15	yu	27	Handwritten	39	Handwritten
4	Handwritten	16	Handwritten	28	Handwritten	40	Handwritten
5	M.T.	17	Handwritten	29	Handwritten	41	Handwritten
6	Lothy	18	Handwritten	30	Handwritten	42	Handwritten
7	Handwritten	19	Handwritten	31	Susan	43	Handwritten
8	Handwritten	20	Handwritten	32	Handwritten	44	Handwritten
9	Handwritten	21	Handwritten	33	Handwritten	45	Handwritten
10	Handwritten	22	Handwritten	34	Handwritten	46	Handwritten
11	Handwritten	23	Handwritten	35	Handwritten	47	Handwritten
12	Handwritten	24	Handwritten	36	Karen	48	Handwritten



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Am	13	[Signature]	25	[Signature]	37	[Signature]
2	[Signature]	14	Wong	26	[Signature]	38	Wong K C
3	Way	15	[Signature]	27	[Signature]	39	[Signature]
4	ling	16	Peter	28	[Signature]	40	[Signature]
5	Lorey	17	[Signature]	29	[Signature]	41	[Signature]
6	King	18	Karen	30	[Signature]	42	[Signature]
7	[Signature]	19	Lany. Ter	31	[Signature]	43	[Signature]
8	[Signature]	20	Andy-Tung	32	[Signature]	44	[Signature]
9	[Signature]	21	[Signature]	33	[Signature]	45	陳國樑
10	[Signature]	22	[Signature]	34	[Signature]	46	[Signature]
11	[Signature]	23	[Signature]	35	[Signature]	47	[Signature]
12	[Signature]	24	[Signature]	36	[Signature]	48	[Signature]



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Carrie	13	oi yee	25		37	Chi
2		14	Ra chuy	26		38	
3		15	Tai	27		39	孫文輝
4	Wm Lee	16	Li Fung Tsz	28		40	王浩
5		17	Choi Jenny	29	Leung Wan Ling	41	
6		18	Choi Ching Ying	30	Titus Yu	42	
7		19	黎子麟	31	Rachel Yu	43	
8	Heidi	20	黃榮生	32	Chan Hoi Tai	44	
9		21		33	Group for	45	鄭國棟
10	RL	22		34	Wood Lam	46	Lyne
11	Nandy	23		35		47	Barry
12	Howard	24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

簽署	簽署	簽署	簽署
1	13	25	37
2	14	26	38
3	15	27	39
4	16	28	40
5	17	29	41
6	18	30	42
7	19	31	43
8	20	32	44
9	21	33	45
10	22	34	46
11	23	35	47
12	24	36	48



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22	LAN FUNG	34		46	
11	A.W.	23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	




請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Jessica	13	M. Lee	25	Sunny	37	GR
2	NANI	14	July	26	Sh	38	Sh
3	Zenas	15	Sh	27	Sh	39	Kenn
4	Sh	16	Sh	28	William	40	Sh
5	Tag	17	Joyce	29	Sh	41	Sh
6	Sh	18	Sh	30	Sh	42	Sh
7	Sh	19	Sh	31	Sh	43	Sh
8	Sh	20	Sh	32	Sh	44	Sh
9	Sh	21	Sh	33	Sh	45	Sh
10	Sh	22	Sh	34	Sh	46	Sh
11	譚曉勻	23	Sh	35	Sh	47	Sh
12	Sh	24	Sh	36	Sh	48	Sh



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25	Christy	37	
2		14		26	Connie	38	何新明
3		15		27	Daniel	39	羅高德
4	曾朝霞	16		28		40	
5		17	Lee Tai	29		41	蘇錦堂
6		18	Lam Chiu	30		42	廖錦珍
7		19	Lei	31		43	
8		20		32	Li Ma Fai	44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34	PATRICIA	46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	




請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Owen	13	Man	25		37	Law
2		14	Ann	26	單蕭	38	Andy
3	Ray	15	John	27	俊	39	John
4	Rob	16	Joe	28	Wai	40	Joe
5	Daniel	17		29	Joe	41	Joe
6	Joe	18	Joe	30	Joe	42	Joe
7	Joe	19	Joe	31	Joe	43	Joe
8	Joe	20	Joe	32	Joe	44	Joe
9	Joe	21	Joe	33	Joe	45	Joe
10	Joe	22	Joe	34	Joe	46	Joe
11	Joe	23	Joe	35	Joe	47	Joe
12	Joe	24	Joe	36	Joe	48	Joe



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25	張麗華	37	
2		14		26	Chow	38	
3		15		27	Tsui	39	
4		16	K. Y. Chan	28	Matthew	40	
5		17		29		41	Owen
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32	Elaine	44	
9		21	Joseph	33		45	
10		22		34	Melody	46	
11		23		35	Angie	47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	Kanako
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Hew	13	b	25	劉志和	37	林國雄
2	Alan	14	Oscar	26	Tim	38	King
3	Ben	15	Meri	27	Anna	39	Alan
4	Glenn	16	Uck	28	Yok	40	John
5	Eric	17	Cize Chan	29	W	41	Sam
6	Paul	18	W	30	W	42	W
7	E	19	Swing	31	W	43	W
8	W	20	John	32	W	44	Kai
9	W	21	W	33	W	45	W
10	王小娟	22	W	34	W	46	W
11	SWAN	23	Xue	35	W	47	W
12	An	24	W	36	W	48	W



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	[Signature]	13	[Signature]	25	[Signature]	37	[Signature]
2	[Signature]	14	[Signature]	26	[Signature]	38	[Signature]
3	[Signature]	15	[Signature]	27	[Signature]	39	[Signature]
4	[Signature]	16	[Signature]	28	[Signature]	40	[Signature]
5	[Signature]	17	[Signature]	29	[Signature]	41	[Signature]
6	[Signature]	18	[Signature]	30	[Signature]	42	[Signature]
7	[Signature]	19	[Signature]	31	[Signature]	43	[Signature]
8	[Signature]	20	[Signature]	32	[Signature]	44	[Signature]
9	[Signature]	21	[Signature]	33	[Signature]	45	[Signature]
10	[Signature]	22	[Signature]	34	[Signature]	46	[Signature]
11	[Signature]	23	[Signature]	35	[Signature]	47	[Signature]
12	[Signature]	24	[Signature]	36	[Signature]	48	[Signature]



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Tsh	25		37	CP Chan
2		14	HA	26		38	CARSON
3		15	Hare	27		39	
4		16	Lei	28		40	3ae
5		17	Daniel	29	Ringo	41	
6		18	Li	30		42	
7		19	Tung	31		43	km
8		20		32		44	Wong
9		21	Alvin	33		45	Greg
10		22	Chau	34	Hilary Lo	46	Yin
11		23		35	Shen	47	
12		24		36	Lee	48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	L	13	ms	25	張子毅	37	張清華
2	g	14	my	26	shu	38	張建華
3	goyce	15	cm	27	oo	39	張建華
4	欣	16	cr	28	g	40	張建華
5	Kelly	17	CARLOS	29	andy	41	Ado
6	ivan	18	ant	30	Ado	42	Ado
7	Paul	19	Ant	31	Wan	43	張建華
8	lucy	20	Ant	32	thx	44	Ado
9	Ant	21	lucy	33	lucy	45	Ado
10	mi	22	OL	34	Ray	46	Ado
11	ky	23	AL	35	Chon	47	Ado
12	Anga	24	BT	36	Ant	48	Ado



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5	黃漢超	17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20	AL.T.	32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22	Jasmine	34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Jacky	13	Alley	25	Sif	37	Wto
2	Leon	14	Ho Chiu	26		38	Kiki
3	Daron	15		27	Wing	39	Julie
4	Andy	16	R	28		40	Shirley
5	Tason	17	Wingputner	29	Chen	41	
6	Wada	18	Ho	30	Andy	42	kin
7		19		31	Leon	43	Ran
8	Gay	20	Wing	32	Julie	44	輝
9	Kc40	21	Wing - Nide	33	Tason	45	鍾成
10		22	Wing	34	Joey	46	Tim
11		23		35	Junior	47	黃偉強
12	黃偉強	24	Andy	36	Ran	48	黃偉強



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	lul	13	林淑寧	25	X	37	O
2	Melody	14	Q.	26	ang	38	W Ho
3	Paul	15		27		39	ching
4		16		28	Green	40	李強
5	Kris	17		29	Wm Sun	41	
6	Patty	18		30	Julia	42	Alan
7	Carry	19		31	Jacky	43	Sone La
8	Bill	20	Priscilla	32	李正強	44	Ray
9		21	Jeff	33	M. 2	45	James
10		22	MA FALUNG	34		46	Long Ching
11		23	MA ASHLYN	35		47	Crystal
12		24	Ana	36		48	Erica



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2	fy	14	Derek	26	Wendy	38	
3	Jim	15		27	Angie	39	Katie
4	M 21/5	16		28	Wendy	40	
5	Brian	17		29	Jane	41	LX
6	Brandon	18		30	Hilda	42	
7		19		31	Priscilla	43	
8		20	Cherrie	32		44	
9		21		33	Coco	45	
10		22		34	Bileen	46	
11		23		35	Howe	47	Mavis
12	Richard	24	Mam	36		48	Chang



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	黃浩朗	25		37	
2		14	陳志軒	26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	譚永基
5	UPN	17	張	29		41	
6	Ulan	18	Brunson	30		42	
7	H.	19	Brian	31	Sum Chan	43	
8	A.	20		32		44	Veronica
9		21		33		45	LAM CHIK
10		22		34		46	Kell
11		23	白展儀	35		47	Dan
12	Aco	24	胡志強	36	莊永澄	48	Cherry

都會駅住宅業主小組委員會

Residential Owners Sub-Committee of Metro Town



METROTOWN
都會駅

請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Wong	25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15	M	27		39	
4		16	CLARE	28		40	Emily
5		17	PUN	29		41	Moses
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21	ORISCELLAHO	33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23	Vivian	35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	A
2		14		26	Martin	38	A
3	Viville	15	Isaiah	27	Caron	39	Barbara
4	Kran	16	H.	28	Anson	40	Dick
5	Lisa	17	H.	29	Ching	41	
6	H.	18	H.	30	Ching	42	
7	H.	19	H.	31	Ching	43	
8	H.	20	H.	32	Ching	44	
9	H.	21	H.	33	Ching	45	
10	H.	22	H.	34		46	
11	H.	23	H.	35		47	A
12	H.	24	H.	36	A	48	A




請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

CCNY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Aachel	25		37	Henry
2	L.	14	Asli	26		38	Brian
3	Chif	15	SC	27	May King	39	Benjamin
4		16	Wong	28		40	L.
5		17	N.	29		41	Lifan
6	Edmund.	18		30		42	
7	Brian	19	A. H. L.	31		43	W. C.
8	Lea.	20	Quincy	32		44	Con
9	Brian	21	Jai	33	N. C.	45	Ken
10	Brian	22		34		46	Y. Him
11	Camre	23	Al	35		47	
12	Judy	24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

簽署	簽署	簽署	簽署
1	13 Rita Choy	25	37
2	14 王人宇	26	38
3	15 TONG W	27	39
4	16 Law	28	40
5	17	29	41
6 Wong Li	18	30	42
7 陳偉	19	31	43
8	20	32	44
9	21 Tina Ch	33	45
10	22	34	46
11 伍	23	35	47
12	24	36	48



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16	H.T	28		40	
5		17	ZZZ...	29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	May	13	Xang	25	WY	37	ISAD PLOH
2	John	14	7	26	John	38	John
3	John	15	John	27	John	39	Man Gik
4	John	16	John	28	John	40	John
5	John	17	John	29	John	41	John
6	John	18	John	30	John	42	John
7	John	19	John	31	John	43	John
8	John	20	John	32	John	44	John
9	John	21	John	33	John	45	John
10	John	22	Michael	34	John	46	John
11	John	23	John	35	John	47	John
12	John	24	John	36	吳卓衡	48	John

請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Horace Tung	13	Jojo	25	Wing	37	Chol
2	Xuexue	14	Chen	26	Yun	38	李柏豪
3	Wai Man	15	Jojo	27	Yun	39	Yun
4	Jojo	16	Chen	28	Hei Yee	40	Yun
5	Yun	17	Chen	29	Yun	41	Yun
6	Yun	18	Yun	30	Yun	42	Yun
7	Yun	19	Yun	31	Yun	43	Yun
8	Yun	20	Yun	32	Yun	44	Yun
9	Cheng	21	Yun	33	Yun	45	Yun
10	Lingling	22	Yun	34	Yun	46	Yun
11	Yun	23	Yun	35	Yun	47	Yun
12	Yun	24	Yun	36	Yun	48	Yun



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Yeliny	25		37	April
2		14	Yan	26	Linda	38	June
3	James	15		27	Lan	39	Jan
4	James	16		28		40	May
5		17		29	Bob	41	Ray
6	Wanna	18		30	Yan	42	Michael
7	Ali	19	Guin	31	Yan	43	Yan
8	Richard	20	葉陳澤男	32	June	44	Charles
9	Charles	21	John	33	Stephanie	45	
10		22		34	Nir	46	John
11	John	23		35	Tammy	47	Leanne
12	Frank	24	郭張	36	Much	48	陳榮光



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	Howard Li
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5	Crystal	17	Nancy	29		41	
6		18	Jack	30		42	
7	Emily	19		31	Ching	43	
8	Gordon	20		32		44	Emily
9		21	2	33		45	
10	Milly	22	C	34		46	
11	Lo	23		35		47	Cybero
12	Yee	24	Peter	36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

簽署	簽署	簽署	簽署
1	13	25	37
2	14	26	38
3	15	27	39
4	16	28	40
5	17	29	41
6	18	30	42
7	19	31	43
8	20	32	44
9	21	33	45
10	22	34	46
11	23	35	47 BELLE
12	24	36	48 CHAMP



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

簽署	簽署	簽署	簽署
1 Dong Yuen	13 [Signature]	25 [Signature]	37 Bernice
2 [Signature]	14 [Signature]	26 [Signature]	38 [Signature]
3 [Signature]	15 [Signature]	27 [Signature]	39 LAURENT
4 [Signature]	16 [Signature]	28 [Signature]	40 [Signature]
5 [Signature]	17 [Signature]	29 [Signature]	41 [Signature]
6 [Signature]	18 [Signature]	30 [Signature]	42 [Signature]
7 [Signature]	19 [Signature]	31 [Signature]	43 [Signature]
8 [Signature]	20 [Signature]	32 [Signature]	44 [Signature]
9 [Signature]	21 [Signature]	33 [Signature]	45 [Signature]
10 [Signature]	22 [Signature]	34 [Signature]	46 [Signature]
11 [Signature]	23 [Signature]	35 [Signature]	47 [Signature]
12 [Signature]	24 [Signature]	36 [Signature]	48 [Signature]



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4	Ken	16		28		40	
5	Ade	17		29		41	
6	Cherry	18		30		42	
7	chier	19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9	Brian	21		33	MT!	45	
10		22		34	Cher	46	Comie
11		23		35	Chix	47	
12		24		36	Cam	48	

都會駅住宅業主小組委員會

Residential Owners Sub-Committee of Metro Town



METROTOWN
都會駅

請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3	E. Wong	15	Wesley	27	CYRUS	39	
4	Ricky Lam	16		28		40	
5	Jennifer Li	17		29		41	
6	Poon Chung-fan	18	Hui	30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20	Chen	32		44	
9		21	Mak	33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	周天成
12		24		36		48	袁嘉英



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Mok HAI PING	13		25		37	
2	Chung Ho Ki	14		26		38	Mo Mo Ching
3	Pun Hoi FAI	15	Lin	27		39	黃愛儀
4	Chau Yuen Hon	16	Lin	28		40	Karen Chee
5	Lee Tze Fan	17		29		41	
6	Tong Hang	18		30		42	
7		19	Harold	31		43	
8		20		32		44	Wendy
9	Tsui Nga	21		33		45	Roger
10	Jan Wong	22		34		46	Kathy
11	Wong Kin Ching	23	Hon	35	Yan	47	Lee
12		24		36		48	

都會駅住宅業主小組委員會

Residential Owners Sub-Committee of Metro Town



MEOTOWN
都會駅

請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	TANA PING	25		37	Tan
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27	Fai	39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33	李敏	45	
10		22		34		46	Dick
11		23		35	李光	47	
12		24		36	大頭	48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

簽署	簽署	簽署	簽署
1	13	25	37
2	14	26	38
3	15	27	39
4	16	28	40
5	17	29	41
6	18	30	42
7	19	31	43
8	20	32	44
9	21	33	45
10	22	34	46
11	23	35	47
12	24	36	48



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	H.	13	[Signature]	25	[Signature]	37	[Signature]
2	[Signature]	14	[Signature]	26	[Signature]	38	[Signature]
3	[Signature]	15	[Signature]	27	[Signature]	39	[Signature]
4	[Signature]	16	[Signature]	28	[Signature]	40	Kehoe
5	[Signature]	17	[Signature]	29	[Signature]	41	[Signature]
6	[Signature]	18	[Signature]	30	[Signature]	42	[Signature]
7	[Signature]	19	[Signature]	31	[Signature]	43	[Signature]
8	[Signature]	20	[Signature]	32	[Signature]	44	[Signature]
9	[Signature]	21	[Signature]	33	[Signature]	45	[Signature]
10	[Signature]	22	[Signature]	34	[Signature]	46	[Signature]
11	[Signature]	23	[Signature]	35	[Signature]	47	[Signature]
12	[Signature]	24	[Signature]	36	[Signature]	48	[Signature]



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Andy Long	13	Amey Chiu	25	K. Z. Lu	37	Suki
2		14		26	K. M. Chai	38	Andy
3		15		27	Cam	39	
4		16	Ler	28		40	Wing S.
5		17	H.	29	Oscar	41	Oscar
6	陳志軒	18	Joe	30		42	
7		19		31	Sam I	43	Florence
8		20		32		44	
9	H.	21		33	Kathy	45	Venus
10	Chan	22		34	Wym	46	
11		23		35	Yan	47	
12	Amy	24		36	家明	48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25	Fong M.	37	
2		14	Elaine	26	Chan L.R.	38	Luby
3	Emily	15		27		39	Luby
4		16	Tachy	28	I Sh	40	Yau Tin Yee
5		17	L.M.	29	Chen	41	
6		18		30	Zeel	42	an
7		19		31	Wang Yu.	43	Cr
8		20		32		44	u v
9		21		33	Kit	45	csid
10		22		34	Winnie Chan	46	an
11		23		35		47	an
12		24	Tung W	36		48	u



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25	♥ Caron An	37	
2	Anthony	14		26	Aaron Fung	38	李德貞
3	Sandy	15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5	Sone	17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31	黎愛蓮	43	
8		20		32	Alex Chan	44	陳妹
9		21		33		45	Jang E
10		22		34		46	王桂蘭
11		23		35	Boell	47	
12		24		36	Ching	48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區





















COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	

請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	ky	13	Qor	25	Timothy	37	L.L
2	艺	14	Qor	26	Q.L.	38	武
3	仲	15	Yung	27	G.C.	39	女
4	宇	16	姜	28	Law	40	2.
5	志	17	Q	29	✗	41	小.
6	Wingel.	18	h	30	h	42	N.W. Chan
7	李太	19	U	31	Susan	43	S. Chan
8	甘	20	h	32	HA	44	王 暉明
9	开	21	楊	33	陳志明	45	王 超恩
10	农	22	雷	34	譚	46	王 太
11	石华	23	SEK W	35	利	47	Q.
12	Long	24	梁志	36	Leimay	48	Q.




請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16	Ward, Cheung	28		40	
5		17		29		41	C-Y LEE
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33	歐陽木棉	45	
10		22		34	歐陽木棉	46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24	Got ch	36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18	Li P. B.	30	朱賜德	42	
7		19		31	Jackey	43	
8		20	Jack Sin	32		44	
9	李德好	21		33		45	
10	李德昌	22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	陳志強	13	de	25	L.	37	李
2	W	14	hunc	26	HSF	38	W
3	W	15	W	27	Ang Yan	39	le
4	W	16	W	28	Hin Yan	40	le
5	W	17	W	29	W	41	W
6	陳進時	18	井村正	30	Kerth Kei	42	W
7	W	19	W	31	Jessie Wong	43	W
8	W	20	W	32	Lai Sheng Tin	44	W
9	W	21	W	33	Syn Yee Ooi	45	W
10	W	22	W	34	W	46	W
11	W	23	W	35	W	47	W
12	W	24	W	36	W	48	W



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25	Leung	37	
2		14		26	David CHAN	38	
3	Bernice	15	Muk	27	Fanny Lam	39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29	Qu He	41	
6	Nancy	18	CHAN MAN	30	廣明	42	
7		19	Jim	31	Z.	43	
8		20	Leonid	32	Edith	44	
9		21		33	Ryan	45	
10	Chun	22	WING	34	Lam	46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	李小姐	13	June	25	Mam	37	Ben
2	Wong	14	林小姐	26	Sunny	38	Ben
3	M.	15	林小姐	27	歐兒	39	Ben
4	Ben	16	林小姐	28	Eason	40	Ben
5	M	17	林小姐	29	Timmy	41	C.
6	Ben	18	林小姐	30	Ben	42	Ben
7	Debbie	19	Ben	31	Ben	43	Wang
8	Ben	20	Ben	32	Ben	44	Ben
9	Jane	21	Ben	33	Ben	45	徐太
10	Patricia	22	Wig	34	Ben	46	丁小姐
11	Ben	23	Cecilia	35	Ben	47	Ben
12	Yung	24	Yung	36	Ben	48	Ben



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	李國雄	13	曾志偉	25	Carin	37	Mel
2	Yanuel	14	洪天	26	梅利	38	Yolanda
3	Yanny	15	Winnie	27	文沙	39	haha
4	Mary	16	陳志	28	Tomy	40	Jenny
5	Okon	17	林少偉	29	John	41	陳嘉
6	W	18	林子聰	30	黃明	42	趙燕
7	Yachy	19	林少豪	31	王明	43	王女
8	李國	20	Wingmy	32	何西	44	Crty
9	王文源	21	Car	33	Emmy	45	林
10	李	22	Car	34	Yung	46	何
11	王	23	Tung	35	Mary	47	王
12	王	24	David	36	Yvon	48	Wice



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2	keith	14	Louisa	26		38	Karen
3		15		27		39	
4	Li Gang	16		28	黃	40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19	譚日輝	31		43	
8		20	Hsie Tsang	32		44	
9		21	Stephen	33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23	Xu	35		47	
12		24		36	Bernard	48	




請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16	Wardley	28		40	
5		17		29		41	C-Y LEE
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33	歐陽木棉	45	
10		22		34	歐陽木棉	46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Tomy	25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15	Nita	27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17	Connie	29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21	Wong Tai	33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Henry	25	Lee	37	
2		14	Ch	26	Jimmy	38	James
3		15	Annie	27	Lee	39	Obay
4		16	Lee	28		40	
5		17	Yanbing	29		41	
6		18		30	Bome	42	
7		19		31		43	Willy
8		20		32	Libby	44	Yael
9	Stacy	21		33	Jason	45	Yan
10		22	Glory	34	Jeffery	46	Joyce
11		23	David	35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	文	13	Lai	25	玲	37	Mun
2	鍾松	14	敏兒	26	紫	38	Ming
3	Gik	15	小麗	27	志	39	楊
4	[Signature]	16	白天一	28	[Signature]	40	Yan
5	V	17	Ming	29	Tak	41	紀音
6	May	18	Li	30	孫小敏	42	Lo
7	HK	19	Polo	31	天佐	43	Man
8	Paul	20	Bee	32	譚	44	Grina
9	J	21	家怡	33	外	45	宋
10	[Signature]	22	嘉嘉	34	Tao	46	源
11	[Signature]	23	Lok	35	Tai	47	智偉
12	[Signature]	24	古	36	芳	48	Mimi



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	李小姐	13		25	Mom	37	
2	Wong	14	林小姐	26	Sunny	38	
3		15	林小姐	27	歐兒	39	
4		16		28	Eason	40	
5	M	17		29	Timothy	41	
6		18		30		42	
7	Debbie	19		31		43	Wang
8		20		32	Jimmy	44	
9	Tara	21		33	Tony	45	徐太
10	Patricia	22	Wing	34		46	丁小姐
11		23	Cecilia	35		47	
12		24	Yung	36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30	Jim Wong	42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32	金玉珠	44	
9		21		33	Kaka	45	
10		22	Bob.	34	孔志剛	46	
11		23		35	孔志明	47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Inc.	13	[Signature]	25	[Signature]	37	[Signature]
2	Guy	14	[Signature]	26	[Signature]	38	[Signature]
3	[Signature]	15	James	27	[Signature]	39	[Signature]
4	[Signature]	16	[Signature]	28	[Signature]	40	[Signature]
5	Gria	17	[Signature]	29	[Signature]	41	[Signature]
6	ASAS	18	[Signature]	30	[Signature]	42	[Signature]
7	朱夏莉	19	[Signature]	31	[Signature]	43	[Signature]
8	林玉佩	20	[Signature]	32	[Signature]	44	[Signature]
9	劉強	21	[Signature]	33	[Signature]	45	[Signature]
10	JEFF	22	[Signature]	34	[Signature]	46	[Signature]
11	[Signature]	23	[Signature]	35	[Signature]	47	[Signature]
12	[Signature]	24	[Signature]	36	[Signature]	48	[Signature]



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	[Signature]	13	[Signature]	25	[Signature]	37	[Signature]
2	[Signature]	14	[Signature]	26	[Signature]	38	[Signature]
3	[Signature]	15	[Signature]	27	[Signature]	39	[Signature]
4	Ace	16	[Signature]	28	[Signature]	40	[Signature]
5	[Signature]	17	[Signature]	29	[Signature]	41	[Signature]
6	[Signature]	18	[Signature]	30	[Signature]	42	[Signature]
7	Armeny	19	[Signature]	31	[Signature]	43	[Signature]
8	[Signature]	20	[Signature]	32	[Signature]	44	[Signature]
9	[Signature]	21	[Signature]	33	[Signature]	45	[Signature]
10	[Signature]	22	[Signature]	34	[Signature]	46	[Signature]
11	[Signature]	23	[Signature]	35	[Signature]	47	[Signature]
12	[Signature]	24	Beryl	36	[Signature]	48	[Signature]



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25	Ace	37	
2		14		26		38	
3	Ace	15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5	Boris	17	Chen	29		41	
6	Janin	18		30		42	
7	Glynn	19	Cherry	31		43	
8		20	劉嘉玲	32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11	Ace	23	Lee May	35		47	
12		24	Nob	36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18	PETER CHENG	30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8	Anthony	20		32		44	Nancy
9	Leander	21		33	Madel	45	
10	Ching Wai	22	Madar	34	Ian	46	
11	Ching Wai	23		35		47	
12	Chan	24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	潘小姐
2		14		26		38	Jessie
3		15		27		39	基
4		16		28		40	
5	Taylor Chung	17		29		41	Wong Suk Kit
6	Shin Chy	18		30		42	勝
7		19		31		43	Wing
8		20		32		44	Jack
9	Cherry	21	Isabella	33	Chris	45	王寶光
10	Chris	22	my lei	34	Chris Fung	46	王寶生
11	Jack	23		35	Shirley	47	
12	Jessie	24	Cheng Pui Lee	36	王偉新	48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18	Li P. B.	30	朱智強	42	
7		19		31	Jacky	43	
8		20	Mark Sin Yig	32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	陳志強	13	de	25	L.	37	李
2	ly	14	huse	26	tsip	38	WIP
3		15	scribble	27	long Yan	39	le
4	yau	16	scribble	28	hin Yan	40	el
5		17	ku	29	WY	41	scribble
6	陳超時	18	井村正	30	Kerh Kei	42	scribble
7	scribble	19	WY	31	Jessie Wong	43	scribble
8	scribble	20	scribble	32	Lai Sheng Tin	44	scribble
9	scribble	21	scribble	33	Syn Yee Ooi	45	scribble
10	scribble	22	Lup	34	scribble	46	scribble
11	scribble	23	Liah	35	scribble	47	scribble
12	Go	24	Any	36	En	48	En



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13	Chan	25		37	
2		14		26	Jones	38	
3	Shen	15		27		39	
4	Amber	16		28		40	Tor L
5	Helen	17		29		41	
6	Cathy	18		30	Yan	42	
7		19	Hee	31	EB	43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33	陳元	45	
10		22		34	trumen	46	
11	2	23		35	何	47	
12		24		36		48	



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1		13		25		37	
2		14		26		38	
3		15		27		39	
4		16		28		40	
5		17		29		41	
6		18		30		42	
7		19		31		43	
8		20		32		44	
9		21		33		45	
10		22		34		46	
11		23		35		47	
12		24		36		48	

都會駅住宅業主小組委員會

Residential Owners Sub-Committee of Metro Town



METROTOWN
都會駅

請各住戶 一同簽名支持

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

COPY

	簽署		簽署		簽署		簽署
1	Chung	13	Li	25	Ho	37	So
2	Wong	14	Ng	26	Chan	38	So
3	Chan	15	Chau	27	Siu	39	Wong
4	Chau	16	Hing	28	Lo	40	Siu
5	Law	17	Yan	29	Chau	41	Chau
6	Connell	18	W	30	Wong	42	Hing
7	Shelley	19	Lo	31	Wong	43	Yan
8	Sh	20	Wong	32	W	44	Ming
9	Hing	21	Siu	33	W	45	Wing
10	Ang	22	Tung	34	W	46	Hon
11	Wong	23	W	35	W	47	Lee
12	McCann	24	Cyr	36	W	48	Chan



T6

請各住戶 一同簽名支持

COPY

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

		Lee	Lee
co		Wing	Chen
Lee			Ng
Wong		Yip	Wong
Wong		Long	Ng
Wong		Chung	Chen
Agnes		Ng	Ng
Lo		Ho	Ng
So Lay		Li	Ng
		Yip	Lo
Chen		C. C.	
Ko		Yip	
		Lo	Yip
Mike		Yip	Chen
Donald		X. X.	Ng
Wong	Long		Ng
Yip	Chen		Ng
Wong	Shen	Wong	Ng
	Ng	Ng	Ng
	Wong	Tong	Ng



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

COPY

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

Wendy	陳名	AA	Cee
Olivia	陳名	AA	AA
Jennifer	1.5 CHAN	AA	AA
Katzen	AA	AA	AA
Constance	AA	AA	AA
Tung	AA	AA	AA
THAN ERI-OK	AA	AA	AA
霍輝	AA	AA	AA
W. M. Choi	AA	AA	AA
郭/名	AA	AA	AA
Tung Yee Hung	AA	AA	AA
Wong Lai Wah	AA	AA	AA
AA	AA	AA	AA
AA	AA	AA	AA
AA	AA	AA	AA
AA	AA	AA	AA
林淑儀	AA	AA	AA
洗太	AA	AA	AA
洗太	AA	AA	AA
Angela	AA	AA	AA

COPY

96

COPY

[illegible]



請各住戶
一同簽名支持

COPY

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

[illegible]

COPY

[illegible]

COPY

100



T10

請各住戶 一同簽名支持

COPY

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

	Wedy		
	Lau	Wong	
	Wei Wai	王永泳	Tong Yau Yu
		Le	Lau Sau L.
Leung	廖三豪	Daisy	Engineer
Gir	Li Fung Tsz	Dek	
Chan		許志剛	
		王小玲	
	Jenny Ky		
	C.P. Ching		
	Tang Yk		
		Anne	
	Wang	Tina	
	Shen		Casson
Keith	Lau		Zenig

COPY

[illegible]

請各住戶
一同簽名支持

COPY

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

J	Sue	Diana	JG
Bon	Sue	Maria	PJ
Ryan	PJ	JM	Cam
Cam	XBD	Kentley	Chang
Nm	XBD	Ishan	Chang
Donna	G	Anne	PJ
Alex	Alex	Fred	PJ
Cop	George	E.M.	Lisa
W	Mandy	H.E.H.	Chole
A	AM	H.E.H.	Ally
Perun	Am	Rehan	Ciphar
Other	Am	A	Ang
M.M.	Car	A	A
M.R. Tal	Fung	Ca	Ugo
M.H. Wang	Pipin	Colo	De
Therese	Leph	Bryan	Z
Lucy	V	John	Y
Edgar	Tee Hoi Yin	Rob	Mar
Tanya	W	Jon	Chris
Willie	Lianna	a a	Ray



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

COPY

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

my	Tingler	B	Get
Sydney	BBS	long	in
Don	Tim	pon	yan
Estmy	my	JK	Yuna
fu	XN	Yuna	Q
Lucy	person	PA	for
Don	gabid	curi	terba
OLQ	COX	Samen	Get
Wespro	anyong	ma	uan
James	Samen	Abu	王
Jason	Estmy	Q	Q
W	Long	W	Q
Just	me	pon	Q
gab	X	Yes	Q
Lee	Q	pendu	Q
Estmy	Q	Q	Q
John	Q	Q	Q
Q	Q	Yes	Q
X	Q	Q	Q
Q	Q	Q	Q



請各住戶 一同簽名支持

COPY

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

July	Tap David	20	小丁
林美	KK	Mary	加吧
Oliver	Chr	王善善	Eda
王林	Green	冯光耀	小小
John	Chr	李佳怡	大大
Virginie	Yol	鍾冠五	如姐
24	Jessica	Apple	JO
John	吳新	Jolin	Vhy
林美	吳王	Eva	un
吳浩文	吳伯	Mary	ler
Gha	新八	baby	un
Justin	神4	刘冬	un
Dave	小金良	关羽	un
black	起春	张长	Joe
John	???	曹操	John
Johnson	???	me	Wang
Jack	劉思	OK	Wang
曾育安	劉宇恩	胡Lucia	un
John F	un	un	un
Jason	Grace	鄭志強	un

COPY

[illegible]

COPY

[illegible]

請各住戶
一同簽名支持

COPY

要求立法會否決擴建將軍澳堆填區

[illegible]

To: "wklo@engineer.com" <wklo@engineer.com>, "lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk" <lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk>, "jkstolegco@gmail.com" <jkstolegco@gmail.com>, "klclegco@gmail.com" <klclegco@gmail.com>, "elau@dphk.org" <elau@dphk.org>, "yctam@dab.org.hk" <yctam@dab.org.hk>, "arazack@netvigator.com" <arazack@netvigator.com>, "khwong@ftulegco.org.hk" <khwong@ftulegco.org.hk>, "info@cydho.org.hk" <info@cydho.org.hk>, "garychk@dab.org.hk" <garychk@dab.org.hk>, "leungkl@leungkl.org" <leungkl@leungkl.org>, "ipkh@dab.org.hk" <ipkh@dab.org.hk>, "contact@alanleong.net" <contact@alanleong.net>, "albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk" <albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk>, "legco@michaeltien.hk" <legco@michaeltien.hk>, "tpc@jamestien.com" <tpc@jamestien.com>, "frankieyick@liberal.org.hk" <frankieyick@liberal.org.hk>, "chiwaioffice@gmail.com" <chiwaioffice@gmail.com>, "fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com" <fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com>, "fkmaoffice@gmail.com" <fkmaoffice@gmail.com>, "charlesmok@charlesmok.hk" <charlesmok@charlesmok.hk>, "benchanlegco@gmail.com" <benchanlegco@gmail.com>, "info@chankalok.hk" <info@chankalok.hk>, "yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk" <yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk>, "amlegco@gmail.com" <amlegco@gmail.com>, "info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk" <info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk>, "helenawonghk@gmail.com" <helenawonghk@gmail.com>, "eq@eqweb.hk" <eq@eqweb.hk>, "chianglaiwan@gmail.com" <chianglaiwan@gmail.com>, "office@chungsk.com" <office@chungsk.com>, "info@tonytsewaichuen.com" <info@tonytsewaichuen.com>

From: siu dogss <

Date: 05/05/2014 05:00PM

Cc: "info@livingislands.org.hk" <info@livingislands.org.hk>, "cb1@legco.gov.hk" <cb1@legco.gov.hk>, dogss siu <siudogss@outlook.com>

Subject: Excessive Cost of EPD Proposed Integrated Waste Management Facility

Dear Member of the Legco Finance Committee and Public Works Sub Committee,

I write to ask for your consideration of the concerns I have regarding the proposal by the EPD to construct a giant incinerator on reclaimed land off Shek Kwu Chau.

The cost of the EPD proposal is excessive and wasteful – HK\$18 billion for a single incinerator, including huge land reclamation work and the destruction of natural habitats in an area of outstanding natural beauty. Of course, the money is not a problem for Hong Kong with its huge surplus, but should the Environment Bureau be allowed to be so wasteful of tax-payers money if it is not necessary?

Surely Government can tackle the problem of waste management in ways that are less wasteful of tax-payers money?

The EPD have consistently lied about the total tonnage of waste being recycled in Hong Kong, and they have totally misled us with the cost of building the Organic Waste Treatment plant in North Lantau. The current forecasts of the costs of this Project have risen far out of line with construction inflation. The information in the EPD Blueprint for Waste Management therefore lacks all credibility and should not be believed. The costs will simply escalate out of control and the incinerator operation may never achieve the tonnages forecast by the EPD.

My opinion is that tax-payers money will be better spent and will realise greater value for tax-payers by addressing the waste problems at source. Smaller-scale, fully integrated waste management facilities will provide solutions on a district by district basis, will be more effective and more manageable, and will encourage personal responsibility for the amounts of waste that we all produce.

I hope that you reject the EPD proposals and make the right decision for the future of Hong Kong – Asia's World City.

Yours sincerely

RAYMOND SIU

Members of LIVING CHEUNG CHAU

5th May, 2014

To: "wklo@engineer.com" <wklo@engineer.com>, "lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk" <lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk>, "jkstolegco@gmail.com" <jkstolegco@gmail.com>, "klclegco@gmail.com" <klclegco@gmail.com>, "elau@dphk.org" <elau@dphk.org>, "yctam@dab.org.hk" <yctam@dab.org.hk>, "arazack@netvigator.com" <arazack@netvigator.com>, "kh Wong@ftulegco.org.hk" <kh Wong@ftulegco.org.hk>, "info@cydho.org.hk" <info@cydho.org.hk>, "garychk@dab.org.hk" <garychk@dab.org.hk>, "leungkl@leungkl.org" <leungkl@leungkl.org>, "ipkh@dab.org.hk" <ipkh@dab.org.hk>, "contact@alanleong.net" <contact@alanleong.net>, "albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk" <albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk>, "legco@michaeltien.hk" <legco@michaeltien.hk>, "tpc@jamestien.com" <tpc@jamestien.com>, "frankieyick@liberal.org.hk" <frankieyick@liberal.org.hk>, "chiwaioffice@gmail.com" <chiwaioffice@gmail.com>, "fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com" <fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com>, "fkmaoffice@gmail.com" <fkmaoffice@gmail.com>, "charlesmok@charlesmok.hk" <charlesmok@charlesmok.hk>, "benchanlegco@gmail.com" <benchanlegco@gmail.com>, "info@chankalok.hk" <info@chankalok.hk>, "yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk" <yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk>, "amlegco@gmail.com" <amlegco@gmail.com>, "info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk" <info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk>, "helenawonghk@gmail.com" <helenawonghk@gmail.com>, "eq@eqweb.hk" <eq@eqweb.hk>, "chianglaiwan@gmail.com" <chianglaiwan@gmail.com>, "office@chungsk.com" <office@chungsk.com>, "info@tonytsewaichuen.com" <info@tonytsewaichuen.com>
From: Steve Quilkey <stuki2@hotmail.com>
Date: 05/05/2014 06:25PM
Cc: Living Islands <info@livingislands.org.hk>, "cb1@legco.gov.hk" <cb1@legco.gov.hk>
Subject: EPD's approach to Waste Management of great concern!

Quilkey'

Mr. Steven Robert

HKID; I

05th May 2014

Dear Member of the Legco Finance Committee and Public Works Sub Committee

Excessive Cost of EPD Proposed Integrated Waste Management Facility

I write to ask for your consideration of the concerns I have regarding the proposal by the EPD to construct a giant incinerator on reclaimed land off Shek Kwu Chau.

The cost of the EPD proposal is excessive and wasteful – HK\$18 billion for a single incinerator, including huge land reclamation work and the destruction of natural habitats in an area of outstanding natural beauty. Of course, the money is not a problem for Hong Kong with its huge surplus, but should the Environment Bureau be allowed to be so wasteful of tax-payers money if it is not necessary?

Surely Government can tackle the problem of waste management in ways that are less wasteful of tax-payers money?

The EPD have consistently lied about the total tonnage of waste being recycled in Hong Kong, and they have totally misled us with the cost of building the Organic Waste Treatment plant in North Lantau. The current forecasts of the costs of this Project have risen far out of line with construction inflation. The information in the EPD Blueprint for Waste Management therefore lacks all credibility and should not be believed. The costs will simply escalate out of control and the incinerator operation may never achieve the tonnages forecast by the EPD.

My opinion is that tax-payers money will be better spent and will realise greater value for tax-payers by addressing the waste problems at source. Smaller-scale, fully integrated waste management facilities will provide solutions on a district by district basis, will be more effective and more manageable, and will encourage personal responsibility for the amounts of waste that we all produce.

I hope that you reject the EPD proposals and make the right decision for the future of Hong Kong – Asia's World City.

Yours sincerely

Steven Robert Quilkey

HKID;

To: wklo@engineer.com, lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk, jkstolegco@gmail.com, kiclegco@gmail.com, elau@dphk.org, yctam@dab.org.hk, arazack@netvigator.com, khwong@ftulegco.org.hk, info@cydho.org.hk, garychk@dab.org.hk, leungkl@leungkl.org, ipkh@dab.org.hk, contact@alanleong.net, albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk, legco@michaeltien.hk, tpc@jamestien.com, frankieyick@liberal.org.hk, chiwaioffice@gmail.com, fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com, fkmaoffice@gmail.com, charlesmok@charlesmok.hk, benchanlegco@gmail.com, info@chankalok.hk, yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk, amlegco@gmail.com, info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk, helenawonhk@gmail.com, eq@eqweb.hk, chianglaiwan@gmail.com, office@chungsk.com, info@tonytsewaichuen.com

From:

Date: 05/06/2014 09:02AM

Cc: cb1@legco.gov.hk

Subject: Re: IWMF phase 1 proposal should be rejected based on clear project management perspectives

Dear Honourable Members of the Public Works Subcommittee

Our organisation urges you to reject the current proposal by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP), which is supported by the Secretary for the Environment, to upgrade 177DR to Category A at an estimated cost of \$18,245.7 million in money-of-the-day (MOD) prices for the design and construction of the integrated waste management facilities (IWMF) phase 1. [PWSC(2014-15)7]

Since last writing to you on 14 April our position has not changed. We are still urging you to reject the current proposal.

Our current lack of support for the proposal is based on a number of concerns that are directly related to the poor design of the current proposal which lacks a truly integrated waste management approach. We previously outlined to you 7 areas of project management that clearly show this current proposal can be significantly improved upon using suggestions and approaches presented elsewhere by government

departments, community groups, professional bodies, chambers of commerce and individuals.

We are extremely disappointed that basically none of these suggestions and approaches have been assessed in any meaningful way by either EPD or ENB.

Our organization believes it would be irresponsible for any legislator to approve the current approach that you are being asked to vote on.

We are more than willing to meet with anyone of you to hear your concerns and to outline alternatives which can help HK have a truly world leading approach to waste management rather than the proposed approach which is just building bigger burning infrastructure than other countries and making larger piles of waste.

Regards
Dr Merrin Pearce
Chairman
Living Islands Movement
<http://www.livingislands.org.hk>

On 2014-04-14 08:39, info@livingislands.org.hk wrote:

> Dear Honourable Members of the Public Works Subcommittee,
>
> Our organisation urges you to reject the current proposal by the
> Director of Environmental Protection (DEP), which is supported by the
> Secretary for the Environment, to upgrade 177DR to Category A at an
> estimated cost of \$18,245.7 million in money-of-the-day (MOD) prices
> for the design and construction of the integrated waste management
> facilities (IWMF) phase 1. [PWSC(2014-15)7]
>
> While the Panel on Environmental Affairs has now approved (by 9 votes
> to 6) the same basic ENB proposal to "burn and bury" our waste that
> they rejected approximately 2 years ago, we urge you not to blindly
> follow their approval which is meant to have been based on
> environmental concerns. We believe that the 9 members of the EA Panel
> who voted in favour have clearly shown their lack of concern for the
> natural environment of Hong Kong.
>
> As members of the Public Works committee, where your expertise is more
> on project management and engineering solutions, you should see that
> the current proposal to extend 3 landfills and build a mega
> incinerator does not solve the problem we are facing with Municipal
> Solid Waste (MSW) in the most timely or financially responsible way.
>
> We urge you to reject the current proposal based on the clear project
> management perspectives of:
>
> - Timing:
> building the incinerator next to Shek Kwu Chau (SKC) will take many
> more years than the alternative site of the Tsang Tsui Ash Lagoons.
>
> - Cost:
> selecting a site that does not require reclamation would significantly
> reduce the cost of the project. The difference in costs has been
> estimated to be the equivalent of building a new hospital (\$2.5
> Billion for the recently opened Tung Chung Hospital)
>
> - Technology:
> the current proposal contains no practical proposal for mechanically
> sorting the majority of our waste before it is either sent to a
> landfill or incinerator. The proposed SKC pilot sorting plant will

- > only be able to handle about 2% of the total MSW
- >
- > - Performance Measure:
- > There are no performance incentives within the proposal for the
- > government to implement meaningful recycling services. How can you
- > trust the government to implement the recycling services once you have
- > approved the "bury and burn" based proposal?
- >
- > - Inefficient Land Use:
- > The land area of the existing landfills sites should be used as
- > Integrated Waste Management Facilities (IWMF) rather than being only
- > used for landfill. An IWMF should include building multi-storey waste
- > sorting facilities to separately identify recyclables, organics and
- > hazardous materials.
- >
- > - Private Sector Competition:
- > There have been numerous offers from the business sector over the
- > years to help solve the waste issue from a commercial perspective.
- > These have included offers to take 1/3 of the current MSW to piloting
- > of the very latest thermal treatment technology.
- >
- > - Risk Management:
- > How can building one mega incinerator operated by one company out in
- > the ocean provide contingency measures if this single plant has
- > operational issues. Surely multiple smaller IWMF's located around HK
- > can truly represent a balanced spatial distribution of Waste
- > Management Facilities and provide superior operational risk
- > management.
- >
- > Regards
- > Dr Merrin Pearse
- > Chairman
- > Living Islands Movement
- > <http://www.livingislands.org.hk>

To: wklo@engineer.com, lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk, jkstolegco@gmail.com, klclegco@gmail.com, elau@dphk.org, yctam@dab.org.hk, arazack@netvigator.com, khwong@ftulegco.org.hk, info@cydho.org.hk, garychk@dab.org.hk, leungkl@leungkl.org, ipkh@dab.org.hk, contact@alanleong.net, albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk, legco@michaeltien.hk, tpc@jamestien.com, frankieyick@liberal.org.hk, chiwaioffice@gmail.com, fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com, fkmaoffice@gmail.com, charlesmok@charlesmok.hk, benchanlegco@gmail.com, info@chankalok.hk, yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk, amlegco@gmail.com, info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk, helenawonghk@gmail.com, eq@eqweb.hk, chianglaiwan@gmail.com, office@chungsk.com, info@tonytsewaichuen.com
From: Andrew Hockings
Date: 05/06/2014 12:13PM
Cc: info@livingislands.org.hk, cb1@legco.gov.hk
Subject: Very concerned with EPD's approach to Effective Waste Management

Andrew Hockings

Hong Kong

HKID: I

6th May 2014.

Dear Member of the Public Works Sub Committee

EPD Proposed Incinerator for Shek Kwu Chau

I write to express my concern for Hong Kong regarding the lack of effective strategies for managing waste in the SAR. It is indeed sad and disappointing that the Environment Bureau has not come up with a holistic approach to the SAR's waste problems, preferring instead the easy option of "just burn it all – problem solved!"

The Environment Bureau proposal for dealing with Hong Kong's waste problem does **not** represent an integrated process for our waste – despite the IWWMF name they have given it. They are taking the easy and most expensive option which will involve minimal waste sorting and mass incineration of unsorted waste. There will be no incentive to reduce waste or sort waste if it is all going to be dumped in the furnace for disposal, regardless of the damage this does to the environment, air quality and human health.

Other countries, notably Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, have implemented effective processes for waste reduction at source, have applied waste charging where appropriate, encouraged practices for sorting of recyclables, are dealing effectively with recovered recyclables, and only as a last resort do they finally dispose of residual waste by landfill or thermal treatment? Hong Kong is lagging way behind these and other Asian countries in effectively dealing with its recyclable waste – and it appears that years of inactivity by the Environment Bureau are to blame. We are in the situation we are in because of a failure to act responsibly to manage waste. Why is it so difficult for the EPD? Building a huge incinerator will only benefit the construction industry and the operator of the plant. The people of Hong Kong will not benefit from this.

Why is it so difficult to implement effective waste sorting at high-rise housing estates? Are certain departments obstructing waste management solutions because it is "too hard" for them to do anything about it? Waste can be smelly and unpleasant, but dealing with waste at source and applying effective sorting and recovery of recyclables is the right thing to do, and it can be done.

I urge you to reject the EPD proposals for Incineration. Hong Kong deserves better than this.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Hockings.

To: wklo@engineer.com, lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk, jkstolegco@gmail.com, klclegco@gmail.com, elau@dphk.org, yctam@dab.org.hk, arazack@netvigator.com, khwong@ftulegco.org.hk, info@cydho.org.hk, garychk@dab.org.hk, leungkl@leungkl.org, ipkh@dab.org.hk, contact@alanleong.net, albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk, legco@michaeltien.hk, tpc@jamestien.com, frankieyick@liberal.org.hk, chiwaioffice@gmail.com, fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com, fkmaoffice@gmail.com, charlesmok@charlesmok.hk, benchanlegco@gmail.com, info@chankalok.hk, yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk, amlegco@gmail.com, info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk, helenawonghk@gmail.com, eq@eqweb.hk, chianglaiwan@gmail.com, office@chunqsk.com, info@tonytsewaichuen.com
From: Andrew Hockings
Date: 05/06/2014 12:15PM
Cc: info@livingislands.org.hk, cb1@legco.gov.hk
Subject: Concerned with Climate Change and Health of EPD's approach to Waste Management

Sarah Britton

Hong Kong
HKID:

6th May, 2014

Dear Member of the Public Works Sub Committee

EPD Proposed Integrated Waste Management Facility

I am writing to you to express my deep concern regarding the proposed Incinerator for which the Environmental Protection Department needs your approval before proceeding.

My main concerns are on the impacts on Climate Change and Human Health.

There are two levels of concern. Firstly, it is estimated that for every one tonne of waste that is incinerated, one tonne of carbon dioxide is released into the atmosphere. This means three thousand tonnes of CO₂ will be released every day from the giant incinerator, according to EPD estimates of waste to be incinerated. Whilst not immediately threatening to human health, there is no doubt that this will have a negative effect on climate change. Should Hong Kong be endorsing this kind of approach when there are other less damaging options available?

My second concern is that the EPD proposal takes insufficient account of the Hong Kong AQO. Are there any statistics to prove scientifically exactly what toxins will be emitted from the Incinerator? Have the EPD compared the forecast emissions with the 2012 AQO's? If so, will they be kind enough to share the figures with us all? It is a fact that moving grate incinerators do emit toxic elements into the atmosphere. It is interesting that the Government Medical Department have not so far expressed any opinion on this matter regarding the impacts of the Incinerator releasing dioxins and particulates into the atmosphere. One wonders how many premature deaths are "acceptable" to Hong Kong as a consequence of large scale moving-grate incineration.

On 16th April 2012, the EPD produced a Discussion Paper for the Panel on Environment Affairs Sub Committee on Improving Air Quality. The purpose of the Paper was to seek *"the views of Members on the proposed new Air Quality Objectives (AQOs) and air quality improvement measures for achieving these new Objectives"*. The Paper did not mention Incineration as a contributory cause of deteriorating air quality, but under the heading of Economic Implications, sections 11 and 12 discuss;

*"The delivery of the proposed new AQOs and the air quality improvement measures would help combat air pollution, thereby improving quality of life, reducing medical cost and indirectly raising labour productivity. The consultant estimates that about 4,200 unnecessary hospital admissions and 7,400 statistical life years would be saved each year (or an improved average life expectancy of around one month for the entire population) upon attainment of the proposed new AQOs[2]. Other health benefits, such as less people contracting asthma or other respiratory diseases, would also be expected. In addition, **better air quality and visibility would help attract more tourists and foreign investments, and are conducive to attracting talents to stay and work in Hong Kong.** All these would contribute to reinforcing our position as a world city and leading international business hub. The proposal would also facilitate further collaborative efforts with Guangdong in improving regional air quality and the development of environmental industry in the region.*

*The impacts of individual proposed air quality improvement measures, which have to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, would be felt differently by different sectors of the economy. In particular, the more stringent standards and requirements to comply with the proposed AQOs would incur implementation costs for various businesses and raise their operating costs. Moreover, **the proposed AQOs would raise the standards required for obtaining the EIA approval for infrastructural projects,** which may lead to higher mitigation costs in order to comply with the standards. The consultant nevertheless advises that, for indicative purpose, the annualized cost incurred by the public for*

implementing the proposed Phase I air quality improvement measures would be about HK\$ 596 million. This is, however, significantly lower than the anticipated benefit of HK\$ 1,228 million per year due to the improvement of public health."

The EIA Report for Incineration was carried out before the AQO's were revised. Does this mean that emissions from the Incinerator will not have to comply with the revised AQO's?

With the greatest of respect, I would ask that you reject the EPD proposal for incineration and insist that they carry-out proper evaluation of the waste issues and come up with a strategy that does not cause more damage to Hong Kong and her residents.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Britton.

To: <wklo@engineer.com>, <lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk>, <jkstolegco@gmail.com>, <kiclegco@gmail.com>, <elau@dphk.org>, <yctam@dab.org.hk>, <arazack@netvigator.com>, <kh Wong@ftulegco.org.hk>, <info@cydho.org.hk>, <garychk@dab.org.hk>, <leungkl@leungkl.org>, <ipkh@dab.org.hk>, <contact@alanleong.net>, <albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk>, <legco@michaeltien.hk>, <tpc@jamestien.com>, <frankieyick@liberal.org.hk>, <chiwaioffice@gmail.com>, <fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com>, <fkmaoffice@gmail.com>, <charlesmok@charlesmok.hk>, <benchanlegco@gmail.com>, <info@chankalok.hk>, <yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk>, <amlegco@gmail.com>, <info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk>, <helenawonghk@gmail.com>, <eq@eqweb.hk>, <chianglaiwan@gmail.com>, <office@chungsk.com>, <info@tonytsewaichuen.com>

From: WasteHK Info

Date: 05/06/2014 12:48PM

Cc: <cb1@legco.gov.hk>

Subject: HK's Waste does have a "Plan B"

Dear Hon Members of the Public Works Subcommittee

We hope that during the time since our last email on 14 April you have taken the time to look at the "Plan B" options for HK's waste management (<http://wastehk.org/2014/03/14/our-submission-to-ea-panel-the-need-for-plan-b/>).

If you have then you will see that there are many options for the HK Government to significantly improve their approach to Waste Management. With this knowledge we hope you will request that the HK Government withdraws their current plan and comes back with a truly Integrated Waste Management Solution.

Regards

Members of the Integrated Waste Management Action Group

www.wastehk.org

----- On Mon, 14 Apr 2014 17:19:18 -0700 **WasteHK Info**

wrote -----

Dear Hon Members of the Public Works Subcommittee

Our group is very concerned with the Government approach to solving HK's waste issue. The ENB and EPD seem to be only promoting a partial solution that is based on the same approach they have been talking about for decades. Attached is what we call "Plan B", which is a viable alternative that could solve more of the waste issue for a similar or smaller budget in a similar or shorter timeframe.

This proposal has formed the basis of an application to the TPB (http://www.info.gov.hk/tpb/en/plan_application/Y I-SKC 1.html) and also a submission the Panel on Environmental Affairs (copies attached in both English and Chinese).

We urge you to reject the current proposal at the meeting tomorrow morning and request the Government to seriously assess the suggestions raised in the attached submission.

Regards

Members of the Integrated Waste Management Action Group.

www.wastehk.org

To: "wklo@engineer.com" <wklo@engineer.com>, "lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk" <lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk>, "jkstolegco@gmail.com" <jkstolegco@gmail.com>, "klclegco@gmail.com" <klclegco@gmail.com>, "elau@dphk.org" <elau@dphk.org>, "yctam@dab.org.hk" <yctam@dab.org.hk>, "arazack@netvigator.com" <arazack@netvigator.com>, "khwong@ftulegco.org.hk" <khwong@ftulegco.org.hk>, "info@cydho.org.hk" <info@cydho.org.hk>, "garychk@dab.org.hk" <garychk@dab.org.hk>, "leungkl@leungkl.org" <leungkl@leungkl.org>, "ipkh@dab.org.hk" <ipkh@dab.org.hk>, "contact@alanleong.net" <contact@alanleong.net>, "albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk" <albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk>, "legco@michaeltien.hk" <legco@michaeltien.hk>, "tpc@jamestien.com" <tpc@jamestien.com>, "frankieyick@liberal.org.hk" <frankieyick@liberal.org.hk>, "chiwaioffice@gmail.com" <chiwaioffice@gmail.com>, FAN Kwok-wai Gary <fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com>, "fkmaoffice@gmail.com" <fkmaoffice@gmail.com>, "charlesmok@charlesmok.hk" <charlesmok@charlesmok.hk>, "benchanlegco@gmail.com" <benchanlegco@gmail.com>, "info@chankalok.hk" <info@chankalok.hk>, "yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk" <yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk>, "amlegco@gmail.com" <amlegco@gmail.com>, "info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk" <info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk>, "helenawonghk@gmail.com" <helenawonghk@gmail.com>, Elizabeth Quat <eq@eqweb.hk>, "chianglaiwan@gmail.com" <chianglaiwan@gmail.com>, "office@chungsk.com" <office@chungsk.com>, "info@tonytsewaichuen.com" <info@tonytsewaichuen.com>, "cb1@legco.gov.hk" <cb1@legco.gov.hk>

From: Paul Melsom <- [REDACTED]>

Date: 05/07/2014 06:47AM

Subject: Finless Porpoise off Shek Kwu Chau

(See attached file: Submission from Paul Melsom RE Planning Department works Shek Kwu Chau reclamation.docx)

Please do not let the Finless Porpoise become locally extinct

Finless Porpoises habitat -Shek Kwu Chau

6 May 2014

I appeal to the Legislators to investigate the impact that the reclamation works and the long term effects of the Integrated waste management facility (IWMF) will have on the **Finless porpoise population whose habitat lies off Shek Kwu Chau and South Lantau.**

Only two weeks ago I went on a research boat trip to south Lantau and Shek Kwu Chau and we saw an estimated 40 Finless porpoises in the waters around the Soko Islands and in the waters off Shek Kwu Chau which is the exact same location designated for the reclamation for the IWMF (otherwise known as the incinerator).

It was wonderful to see these mammals who are very important as top predators to help maintain a healthy marine habitat.

Finless porpoises are designated as a rare species with a status as vulnerable on IUCN red list and in Hong Kong an important part of their habitat is recognised and known as that being in same location as the proposed reclamation for the IWMF next to Shek Kwu Chau.

It appears the relevant Government Departments of the Agricultural, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) and the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) have conveniently and adequately failed to notify the legislators that if the reclamation along with the IWMF (incinerator) goes ahead then this will bring about catastrophic consequences for these mammals and could lead to their local extinction. We have already seen the consequences of what has happened to the Pink Dolphin population and it is already evident that there is a rapid decline in their reported sightings due to the construction of the Hong Kong –Zhuhai- Macau Bridge.

I appeal to the Legislators to investigate the impact that the reclamation works along with the long term effects of the incinerator will have on the **Finless porpoise population whose habitat lies off South Lantau particularly off Shek Kwu Chau.**

For information on the Hong Kong **Finless Porpoise** please refer to the booklet on the **Finless Porpoise** that were distributed during the Public presentation meeting.

Why should such a wonderful animal like this that has been here for millions of years which lives in the pristine quiet waters off Shek Kwu Chau be put at such risk of extinction in just a few years due to Government incompetence and laziness.

Thank you for reading this,

Paul Melsom Eco-educator and Conservationist

Submission from Paul Melsom Eco-educator and Conservationist

Finless Porpoises habitat -Shek Kwu Chau

6 May 2014

I appeal to the Legislators to investigate the impact that the reclamation works and the long term effects of the Integrated waste management facility(IWMF) will have on the **Finless porpoise population whose habitat lies off Shek Kwu Chau and South Lantau.**

Only two weeks ago I went on a research boat trip to south Lantau and Shek Kwu Chau and we saw an estimated 40 Finless porpoises in the waters around the Soko Islands and in the waters off Shek Kwu Chau which is the exact same location designated for the reclamation for the IWMF(otherwise known as the incinerator).

Finless porpoises are designated as a rare species with a status as vulnerable on IUCN red list and in Hong Kong an important part of their habitat is recognised and known as that being in same location as the proposed reclamation for the IWMF next to Shek Kwu Chau.

It appears the relevant Government Departments of the Agricultural, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) and the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) have conveniently and adequately failed to notify the legislators that if the reclamation along with the IWMF (incinerator) goes ahead then this will bring about catastrophic consequences for these mammals and could lead to their local extinction. We have already seen the consequences of what has happened to the Pink Dolphin population and it is already evident that there is a rapid decline in their reported sightings due to the construction of the Hong Kong –Zhuhai- Macau Bridge.

I appeal to the Legislators to investigate the impact that the reclamation works along with the long term effects of the incinerator will have on the **Finless porpoise population whose habitat lies off South Lantau particularly off Shek Kwu Chau.**

For information on the Hong Kong **Finless Porpoise** please refer to the booklet on the **Finless Porpoise** that were distributed during the Public presentation meeting.

To: "wklo@engineer.com" <wklo@engineer.com>, "lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk" <lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk>, "jkstolegco@gmail.com" <jkstolegco@gmail.com>, "klclegco@gmail.com" <klclegco@gmail.com>, "elau@dphk.org" <elau@dphk.org>, "yctam@dab.org.hk" <yctam@dab.org.hk>, "arazack@netvigator.com" <arazack@netvigator.com>, "khwong@ftulegco.org.hk" <khwong@ftulegco.org.hk>, "info@cydho.org.hk" <info@cydho.org.hk>, "garychk@dab.org.hk" <garychk@dab.org.hk>, "leungkl@leungkl.org" <leungkl@leungkl.org>, "ipkh@dab.org.hk" <ipkh@dab.org.hk>, "contact@alanleong.net" <contact@alanleong.net>, "albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk" <albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk>, "legco@michaeltien.hk" <legco@michaeltien.hk>, "tpc@jamestien.com" <tpc@jamestien.com>, "frankieyick@liberal.org.hk" <frankieyick@liberal.org.hk>, "chiwaioffice@gmail.com" <chiwaioffice@gmail.com>, "fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com" <fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com>, "fkmaoffice@gmail.com" <fkmaoffice@gmail.com>, "charlesmok@charlesmok.hk" <charlesmok@charlesmok.hk>, "benchanlegco@gmail.com" <benchanlegco@gmail.com>, "info@chankalok.hk" <info@chankalok.hk>, "yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk" <yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk>, "amlegco@gmail.com" <amlegco@gmail.com>, "info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk" <info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk>, "helenawonghk@gmail.com" <helenawonghk@gmail.com>, "eq@eqweb.hk" <eq@eqweb.hk>, "chianglaiwan@gmail.com" <chianglaiwan@gmail.com>, "office@chungsk.com" <office@chungsk.com>, "info@tonytsewaichuen.com" <info@tonytsewaichuen.com>

From: Hitop [REDACTED]

Date: 05/07/2014 08:59AM

Cc: "info@livingislands.org.hk" <info@livingislands.org.hk>, "cb1@legco.gov.hk" <cb1@legco.gov.hk>

Subject: Very concerned with EPD's approach to Waste Management

Attention: Member of the Public Works Sub Committee

Proposed Incinerator for Hong Kong

Dear Member of the Public Works Sub Committee,

As a Hong Kong resident, I am extremely concerned about the environmental impacts of the proposed Incinerator in Shek Kwu Chau.

The location is too concentrated and too vulnerable against/due to,

1. Natural Disaster 1: Earthquake and/or Tsunami
2. Natural Disaster 2: Typhoon
3. Human Disaster: Ferry Accident
4. Progress of New Technology
5. No Contingent Plan

Once any disaster 1-3 has happened, the risk is catastrophically to environment which will take for a long time to

recover.

New technology for the incinerator enhances year by year to the remarkable level. If we have only one plant, we have more difficulties renew it and to catch up.

The combination of smaller scale utilising existing facilities will provide various contingent plans in case of any failure occurred in any of plants.

Be closer to the sources waste and existing landfill sites.

Please make a right decision for the future of Hong Kong and Hong Kong people.

Yours sincerely,

Hitomi Sugino:

HK

To: wklo@engineer.com, lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk, jkstolegco@gmail.com, klclegco@gmail.com, elau@dphk.org, yctam@dab.org.hk, arazack@netvigator.com, khwong@ftulegco.org.hk, info@cydho.org.hk, garychk@dab.org.hk, leungkl@leungkl.org, ipkh@dab.org.hk, contact@alanleong.net, albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk, legco@michaeltien.hk, tpc@jamestien.com, frankieyick@liberal.org.hk, chiwaioffice@gmail.com, fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com, fkmaoffice@gmail.com, charlesmok@charlesmok.hk, benchanlegco@gmail.com, info@chankalok.hk, yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk, amlegco@gmail.com, info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk, helenawonhk@gmail.com, eq@eqweb.hk, chianglaiwan@gmail.com, office@chungsk.com, info@tonytsewaichuen.com
From: [REDACTED]
Date: 05/06/2014 09:02AM
Cc: cb1@legco.gov.hk
Subject: Re: IWMF phase 1 proposal should be rejected based on clear project management perspectives

Dear Honourable Members of the Public Works Subcommittee

Our organisation urges you to reject the current proposal by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP), which is supported by the Secretary for the Environment, to upgrade 177DR to Category A at an estimated cost of \$18,245.7 million in money-of-the-day (MOD) prices for the design and construction of the integrated waste management facilities (IWMF) phase 1. [PWSC(2014-15)7]

Since last writing to you on 14 April our position has not changed. We are still urging you to reject the current proposal.

Our current lack of support for the proposal is based on a number of concerns that are directly related to the poor design of the current proposal which lacks a truly integrated waste management approach. We previously outlined to you 7 areas of project management that clearly show this current proposal can be significantly improved upon using suggestions and approaches presented elsewhere by government

departments, community groups, professional bodies, chambers of commerce and individuals.

We are extremely disappointed that basically none of these suggestions and approaches have been assessed in any meaningful way by either EPD or ENB.

Our organization believes it would be irresponsible for any legislator to approve the current approach that you are being asked to vote on.

We are more than willing to meet with anyone of you to hear your concerns and to outline alternatives which can help HK have a truly world leading approach to waste management rather than the proposed approach which is just building bigger burning infrastructure than other countries and making larger piles of waste.

Regards
Dr Merrin Pearce
Chairman
Living Islands Movement
<http://www.livingislands.org.hk>

On 2014-04-14 08:39, info@livingislands.org.hk wrote:

> Dear Honourable Members of the Public Works Subcommittee,
>
> Our organisation urges you to reject the current proposal by the
> Director of Environmental Protection (DEP), which is supported by the
> Secretary for the Environment, to upgrade 177DR to Category A at an
> estimated cost of \$18,245.7 million in money-of-the-day (MOD) prices
> for the design and construction of the integrated waste management
> facilities (IWMF) phase 1. [PWSC(2014-15)7]
>
> While the Panel on Environmental Affairs has now approved (by 9 votes
> to 6) the same basic ENB proposal to "burn and bury" our waste that
> they rejected approximately 2 years ago, we urge you not to blindly
> follow their approval which is meant to have been based on
> environmental concerns. We believe that the 9 members of the EA Panel
> who voted in favour have clearly shown their lack of concern for the
> natural environment of Hong Kong.
>
> As members of the Public Works committee, where your expertise is more
> on project management and engineering solutions, you should see that
> the current proposal to extend 3 landfills and build a mega
> incinerator does not solve the problem we are facing with Municipal
> Solid Waste (MSW) in the most timely or financially responsible way.
>
> We urge you to reject the current proposal based on the clear project
> management perspectives of:
>
> - Timing:
> building the incinerator next to Shek Kwu Chau (SKC) will take many
> more years than the alternative site of the Tsang Tsui Ash Lagoons.
>
> - Cost:
> selecting a site that does not require reclamation would significantly
> reduce the cost of the project. The difference in costs has been
> estimated to be the equivalent of building a new hospital (\$2.5
> Billion for the recently opened Tung Chung Hospital)
>
> - Technology:
> the current proposal contains no practical proposal for mechanically
> sorting the majority of our waste before it is either sent to a
> landfill or incinerator. The proposed SKC pilot sorting plant will

- > only be able to handle about 2% of the total MSW
- >
- > - Performance Measure:
- > There are no performance incentives within the proposal for the
- > government to implement meaningful recycling services. How can you
- > trust the government to implement the recycling services once you have
- > approved the "bury and burn" based proposal?
- >
- > - Inefficient Land Use:
- > The land area of the existing landfills sites should be used as
- > Integrated Waste Management Facilities (IWMF) rather than being only
- > used for landfill. An IWMF should include building multi-storey waste
- > sorting facilities to separately identify recyclables, organics and
- > hazardous materials.
- >
- > - Private Sector Competition:
- > There have been numerous offers from the business sector over the
- > years to help solve the waste issue from a commercial perspective.
- > These have included offers to take 1/3 of the current MSW to piloting
- > of the very latest thermal treatment technology.
- >
- > - Risk Management:
- > How can building one mega incinerator operated by one company out in
- > the ocean provide contingency measures if this single plant has
- > operational issues. Surely multiple smaller IWMF's located around HK
- > can truly represent a balanced spatial distribution of Waste
- > Management Facilities and provide superior operational risk
- > management.
- >
- > Regards
- > Dr Merrin Pearse
- > Chairman
- > Living Islands Movement
- > <http://www.livingislands.org.hk>

From: Serafina Cheung [REDACTED]
To: f_pwsc@legco.gov.hk

Date: Tuesday, May 06, 2014 11:51PM

Subject: Fwd: Plea for Recycling Education and Action - Reject the Mega Incinerator and 2 Remaining Landfill Extensions

History: ➡ This message has been forwarded.

For the Attention: Members, Officials and Officers of the Legco Public Works Committee

Re: Submission against the Proposed Mega Incinerator and the Extensions to the WENT and SENT Landfills

Please note that our submission has already been circulated to members of the PWSC

Please enter our submission in the records of the proceedings of the PWSC. Permission is given for these contents to be displayed for public and press access and use.

Thanks for Kind Attention

Serafina Cheung
 Secretary General

Anesidora Nature and Eco Education Association Ltd.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please note that this sub

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Serafina Cheung [REDACTED]
Date: Sun, May 4, 2014 at 11:53 PM
Subject: Plea for Recycling Education and Action - Reject the Mega Incinerator and 2 Remaining Landfill Extensions
To: wklo@engineer.com, lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk, jkstolegco@gmail.com, klclegco@gmail.com, elau@dphk.org, yctam@dab.org.hk, arazack@netvigator.com, khwong@ftulegco.org.hk, info@cydho.org.hk, garychk@dab.org.hk, leungkl@leungkl.org, ipkh@dab.org.hk, contact@alanleong.net, albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk, legco@michaeltien.hk, tpc@jamestien.com, frankieyick@liberal.org.hk, chiwaioffice@gmail.com, fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com, fkmaoffice@gmail.com, charlesmok@charlesmok.hk, benchanlegco@gmail.com, info@chankalok.hk, yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk, amlegco@gmail.com, info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk, helenawonghk@gmail.com, eq@eqweb.hk, chianglaiwan@gmail.com, office@chungsk.com, info@tonytsewaichuen.com

Dear Sir and Madam Sub-Committee Member ,

Thank you in advance for your kind attention to our submission.

Please see especially the attached recent Speech by the Nobel Prize winner Professor Joseph Stiglitz at the Macau MIECF the end of this e-mail. These videos require attention but will hopefully

give you a view that is position and life changing. This is not just a matter of the government and petty party politics.

Please also find below our submission for the Meeting of the Public Works Sub-Committee on Wednesday 7 May 2014. This is against the proposals for a Mega Incinerator and the landfill Extensions to the WENT and SENT Landfills. The objections are: No Proper Comprehensive Recycling; Global Warming Gases and Pollutant Emissions, replacing the Waste Problem with a Global Warming Climate Change and Health Threat Problems; Unnecessary, Inefficient and Costly Proposals that Mislead and Misrepresent, instead of Creating a Zero Waste Zero Pollution Society.

Re: Comprehensive 'Carbon to Ground' Recycling Education and Action can and should replace both the Mega Incinerator and Landfill Extensions, in a Shorter Time-scale, at Lower Cost, for 90% of the Waste currently sent to Landfills , in a Sustainable Manner .

We wish to make the strongest representations against both the proposals for funding of the Mega Incinerator and the remaining Two Landfill Extensions at the WENT and SENT Landfills.

We consider that both these proposals are completely **unnecessary, irrational, unreasonable, irresponsible and unconscionable**. The proposals are perverse and against all the evidence of the trend to official recycling as the most efficient and effective way of dealing with waste in most developed countries. **The effective official recycling rate in Hong Kong is estimated to be effectively zero**. This has been highlighted by the Green Wall erected around 'Dirty Hong Kong' by Shenzhen to stop 'fake recycling' of dirty plastics waste smuggled to China through and from Hong Kong.

It is brought to members attention that in Europe 510 million people will **no longer send food or green waste and recyclables to either incineration or landfills by the mandatory deadline date of 2020**. By the same date 2020 San Francisco and Taiwan will hit zero waste targets with 100% recycling of all waste. California will hit an 80% recycling rate and create 30,000 new jobs in the recycling and related bio-economy sectors.

Yet Hong Kong is proposing to build a Mega Carbon to Air Incinerator

and operate Landfill Extensions long after the same date at stupendous cost. **Separation at Source** methods with simple digital bar-coded biodegradable bags and affirmative waste charging. i.e. no charge for waste properly separated and only for that not properly separated, is widely proven with over 60 million people in Italy and Spain now using this 'mature' system for up to 85 % recycling rates in 3 years of operation.

Recent visits to Hong Kong and articles by a Dutch delegation and the Dutch Chamber of Commerce have highlighted this position. Figures for recycling in Holland are between 68% and 80%. Figures for waste sent to landfills is between 2% and 4%. Waste to incineration 16%. These figures show the direction correlation between recycling and waste sent to landfills. By 2020 Holland, with the implementation of the new EC standards of no recyclables and food and green waste being sent to either landfills and incineration, will close its remaining landfills and the reduced feedstock will most likely close its remaining dated incinerators due to the lack of any legal feedstock. This is a similar experience to Japan, where incinerator feedstock has directly declined with the increase in rigorous recycling rates. **Combustion replaces a waste problem with a global warming gases and health threatening pollution problem.**

We already have disastrous and dangerous air pollution affecting the health of all the people, and especially long term, the children, of Hong Kong. These 'carbon to air' proposals will put further massive amounts of global warming gases, heat and health damaging pollutants to air.

We now wish to bring to your attention the complete lack of comprehensive recycling education and action in our society and community.

It is our proposition that comprehensive recycling education and action using proven 'carbon to ground' techniques would be a major component of the solution to Hong Kong's waste. Our waste should be viewed as a valuable community resource opportunity not as a waste problem.

Our plea submission is therefore summarised below:

Pandora Hong Kong - A Plea for Comprehensive Recycling Education and Action to the Members of Legco Public Works Sub-Committee and the Chief Executive

For time almost beyond memory our waste has been black bagged and taken to landfills. A total official silence has existed on the different methods available to stop, separate and recycle waste. In effect a policy of 'no recycling.' Waste charging tests continue this silence with no mention of the crucial recycling requirement 'separation at source'. This omission can only be intentional and raises basic questions. Why has our society been kept so uninformed for so long on waste separation and recycling? Why has there been no rigorous education and training to transform public perception to waste as a valuable community resource? Who benefits from this inaction? Would intensive separation and recycling schemes make the proposed incinerator and landfill extensions unnecessary?

Anesidora (From the Earth - The alternative name for Pandora) Nature and Eco Education Association Ltd. has been set up to promote recycling education and training, **the 'missing' soft infrastructure to support a 'Think Green, Go Clean and Live Cool' Hong Kong.** This recycling education would be directly integrated with 18 district recycling schemes for the main waste categories: food and green organic, recyclables and construction, 90% of our waste. Recycling economies create good jobs, result in no waste being sent to landfills or for incineration, and stop harmful global warming gas and pollution emissions.

Our hidden resources:

Students: 830,000 full-time primary, secondary and tertiary students. Most never visit the country side, experience nature or even see the stars. They need at least a week each year ONE WORLD (Outdoor, Nature and Eco) education in our

remaining country side. These students would be a powerful resource to protect and transform Hong Kong's future, with practical experience to nurture social caring, vision, innovation and creativity.

People: 2.2 million households and 3.85 million workers in 18 Districts. Everyone should receive 8 or 9 R's education for participation and commitment. Rethink, Redesign, Relearn, Retrain, Remove, Reduce, Reuse and Recycle; Be Responsible. People are our greatest resource for the future 'Get all their brains in the game'.

Mr and Mrs Leung, during the Chief Executive Election you told us of your green interests. If you really 'Love Nature, the Country-Side and Hong Kong', please immediately rethink and change direction. We urgently need comprehensive recycling education and action. Stop the unsustainable, unnecessary, expensive, irresponsible and unconscionable incinerator and landfill extensions. Please be responsible. Separate at source and recycle.

Dear Members, your decision will effect the long-term future of Hong Kong for at least 30 years.

See the compelling and inspiring speech and question session on the subject of Equality and Environmental Justice by the famous Nobel Prize Winning Economist Joseph Stiglitz at the recent

Macau International Environment Convention and Forum (MIECF).

It is well worth viewing and may make you change your mind to create a Green, Clean and Sustainable Future. Party Politics must be put aside for the sake of nature, our environment and eco-system. Hong Kong and China urgently need to be transformed to help save our Planet Earth. Its the only one we have. This is Pandora Hong Kong and the Battle for Our Environment and Eco-System is Right Now. Its dying in front of our eyes.

Please spend the time to watch it could be life changing !

1. Speech 48 minutes <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hopeykhu4Kw>

2. Interview <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zxbuieKj9MF0>

This plea is particularly made to the DAB Party and its members on the Public works Sub-Committee. Please change your policy stance on this matter to support the health, environment and future of both the people of Hong Kong and China. The Chinese leadership have already committed to the course of action proposed by Professor Stiglitz. Why should Hong Kong be left out of a clean, green and healthy future. Elections are fast approaching and a party with a Zero Waste Recycling Education and Action Policy and Track Record will have real credibility

with the electorate. The Videos are particularly applicable and relevant to both Hong Kong and China.

Please ignore for once the obvious vested interest political considerations and vote to protect the people of Hong Kong .. And China!

It is important to create a 'Go Green, Think Clean and Live Cool' Hong Kong with a healthy and sustainable living environment. Please act as role model for China with 'Smart City' Policies. Please do not create a Dumb, Backward, Dirty and Unsustainable City Future.

Serafina Cheung

General Secretary

Anesidora Nature and Eco Education Association Ltd.

From: Yuk May Maggie Ho [redacted]
To: "f_pwsc@legco.gov.hk" <f_pwsc@legco.gov.hk>

Date: Wednesday, May 07, 2014 02:24AM

Subject: 有關強烈反對環境局建議的「三堆一爐」超過HK\$270億元的超級撥款申請

History: ⇒ This message has been forwarded.

立法會工務小組委員會
(急件)

首先, 本人懇請 貴會的議員不要重蹈環境事務委員會的覆轍, 就是在三月廿八日的公聽會上, 不是在全體所屬委員會的議員出席下, 倉促通過上述的超級撥款申請, 因而令市民感到立法會的議員沒有盡力為公帑做好把關的工作.

其次, 最近爆出的高鐵醜聞一再印證立法會的議員當時一意孤行地漠視民意的決定是錯誤的. 政府因監管港鐵不力以致高鐵工程嚴重延誤, 兼且向公眾隱瞞事實真相, 而公帑極有可能需要為高鐵這個爛攤子付上沉重的代價. 這個庸碌無能的政府經常因監管不力以致公帑被白白浪費已經不是甚麼新鮮事, 兼且它經常為了取得立法會的撥款而無所不用其, 以為「過左海就係神仙」. 因此本人懇請 貴會不要被這個無能政府牽著鼻子走而成為它的「自動提款機」.

最後, 本人懇請 貴會能夠認真考慮本人二月廿四日和三月廿一日遞交給環境事務委員會的意見書, 並代本人質詢環境局有關本人的意見是否可行.

本人質疑究竟香港這麼一個「彈丸之地」是否需要動用超過HK\$270億元去擴建龐大的堆填區和興建超級焚化爐呢? 這個龐大費用比起任何一個有廢物處理設施的地方有過之而無不及, 包括我們的祖國. 這是否也是一個跟環保大趨勢「背道而馳」和「禍港殃民」的做法呢?

因此本人懇請貴會的各位議員假如希望香港市民真的能夠改變浪費的習慣, 就一定要投下有良知的「反對」一票.

市民

陳太

二零一四年五月五日

附件:(一) 二月廿四日意見書
(二) 三月廿一日意見書

Attachments:

Letter-140430.pdf

立法會秘書處
環境事務委員會

傳真: 3529 2837

本人欲查詢有關上述
委員會在三月廿八日舉行有關
「三堆一爐」的議案的公聽會
的會議記錄；包括屬於上述
委員會的立法會議員出席人數、
投票人數、投票議員的名字和
投票結果，還有本人就着上述
公聽會所作出的申述，都懇請
貴會都一一電郵至本人的電郵：

「」

有勞之處，不勝感激。

張

陳太

*備註：可在 5/5/2014 或之前
電郵給本人

二〇一四年四月三十日

From: Yuk May Maggie Ho [mailto:maggieho17@yahoo.com.hk]
To: "f_pwsc@legco.gov.hk" <f_pwsc@legco.gov.hk>

Date: Wednesday, May 07, 2014 02:27AM

Subject: 轉寄：強烈反對環境局要求立法會通過二百七十億元擴建三個堆填區和興建超級焚化爐的費用

History: ⇒ This message has been forwarded.

Yuk May Maggie Ho [mailto:maggieho17@yahoo.com.hk] 於 2014年02月24日 (週一) 2:28 AM 寫道：
 立法會秘書
 處
 環境事務委員會

(急件)

敬啟者：

本人之前透過不同渠道向環境局表達對上述議題強烈反對的意向和提出很多實質和具體的意見,只可惜他們仍然貫徹「意見接受,做事照舊」的官僚作風,還一一以「人肉錄音機」的答案,將本人有建設性的建議拒諸門外.他們那種「固步自封」的心態和「庸碌無能」的表現,完全不符合瞬息萬變的社會環境轉變和市民的期望.

本人的反對的理由和建議如下:-

1. 建築廢料含有很多重金屬和其他有害物質,兼且不能藏於垃圾袋內,加上體積龐大和當中有很多廢料都有銳利的角位,因此很容易令堆填區內的防滲保護膜因受到破壞而造成滲漏,從而影響附近居民的健康,尤其是最近將軍澳堆填區的將軍澳居民的健康更加是危在旦夕,因此建築廢料是應該放置在一個遠離民居的荒島以作堆填,從而保障市民的健康;

2. 環境局應該立即立法增加建築廢料處理費用和入閘費用,以祈改變市民浪費的習慣;

3. 環境局應該立即立法要求有提供外賣的飲食店舖徵收外賣飲食盒稅(可參考膠袋稅和澳門的做法),從而大大減低堆填區的壓力;

4. 環境局應該立即立法要求停止入口洋垃圾;

5. 環境局應該立即進行公眾諮詢研究在全港十八區安裝小型焚化爐的可行性(只會釋出無害的蒸氣),從而大大減低堆填區的壓力. 每個小型焚化爐的成 本只需要港幣三十多萬元,兼且能夠短時間內完成安裝,相比起環境局建議興建的超級焚化爐所涉及的公帑超過一百八十億元和需要長時間才能完成興建,簡直是天壤之別(可參考日本的做法). 因此這個超級焚化爐絕對是勞民傷財和浪費公帑的建議(附註:內地興建焚化爐的費用都只需要十四億至四十億人民幣不等).

一個負責任和重視市民健康的政府是應該先盡力推行所有可行的源頭減費措施以評估成效. 假若成效不彰,最後才考慮擴大末端處理的措施以免恨錯難返. 就以台灣和南韓為例,他們實施了有效的源頭減廢措施之後,根本就不需要擴大任何末端處理的措施,反而之前興建的大型焚化爐因不是經常用得著,以致浪費資源和完全不符合成本效益.

假如環境局肯積極考慮本人以上的反對理由和建議,根本完全不需要擴建三個堆填區和浪費大量公帑興建超級焚化爐,而市民的健康也得以受到保障. 因此本人懇請貴會的所有立法會議員一致否決環境局這個對香港市民百害而無一利的超級撥款申請.

市民

陳太

二零一四年二月二十二
日

From: Peter Reid [REDACTED]
To: wklo@engineer.com, lcc.ntw@dab.org.hk, jkstolegco@gmail.com, CHAN KAM LAM <klclegco@gmail.com>, elau@dphk.org, yctam@dab.org.hk, arazack@netvigator.com, khwong@ftulegco.org.hk, Cyd HO <info@cydho.org.hk>, garychk@dab.org.hk, leungkl@leungkl.org, ipkh@dab.org.hk, contact@alanleong.net, albert.wychan@yahoo.com.hk, legco@michaeltien.hk, tpc@jamestien.com, frankieyick@liberal.org.hk, Chiwai Wu <chiwaioffice@gmail.com>, 范國威議員辦事處 <fankwokwaioffice@gmail.com>, FK Ma <fkmaoffice@gmail.com>, charlesmok@charlesmok.hk, Ben Chan <benchanlegco@gmail.com>, info@chankalok.hk, yhchan@ftulegco.org.hk, Alice MAK <amlegco@gmail.com>, info@cheungchiuhung.org.hk, Helena Wong <helenawonghk@gmail.com>, eq@eqweb.hk, Lai Wan Chiang <chianglaiwan@gmail.com>, office@chungsk.com, info@tonytsewaichuen.com, f_pwsc@legco.gov.hk

Date: Wednesday, May 07, 2014 02:28AM

Subject: Chinese Translation

History: ⇒ This message has been forwarded.

If you have not already received a copy of the Chinese translation of the Submission already made to you by Mr Middleton of Clear the Air, please see enclosed below:

尊敬的立法會議員:

之前我們已就本港將實施的源頭減廢，零廢物排放，廢物處理及回收再用的政策提供了大量的選擇和建議。並對政府正在推廣的三堆一爐方案，用客觀事實，例證，數據予以駁斥，證明政府計劃擴大堆填區和興建超級焚化爐方案違反了：

- 所有環保準則（把碳污染排放空氣中）
- 科學上不成立（缺乏數據和時間表）
- 誤導公眾（沒把分類收集好的垃圾轉為資源，而是再混合起來燃燒唔理！）
- 本末倒置（向配合垃圾分類的市民開徵懲罰性收費，所得的收入沒有用在環保，教育市民正確意識。自己卻持續污染環境。）

這些客觀自明的資料和數據，都是The **Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM)**支持的。**CIWEM UK**是一個獨立專業機構，其研發科技並對水資源和環境管理是以綠色潔淨及可持續發展為依歸。Dr. Tom Evans 是這領域的典範，亦是**CIWEM UK**的主席。該機構的環保準則在全球廣泛實施，其廚餘處理轉化和回收技術，污水處理系統已被證明對本港完全適用：

www.ciwem.org/policy-and-international/policy-position-statements/food-waste-disposers.aspx

利用上述的廚餘收集裝置，轉運到處理站，即可將本港日常的家居廢物減少40%
 相關資料：

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/rhjwr50vpd2vxf9/9iFT527h3Z?n=155421562>

此外，我們亦有本地企業"China Everbright International"的氣化技術 (Plasma Gasification)。該技術把有毒的，不能簡單回收的如建築廢料等實施氣化，零污染。將廢物轉變成可再用物料和清

潔能源。

我們呼籲全體立法會議員，注意到本港四年內實施零污染，零排放，在經濟上，技術上完全做得到。在的**CIWEM**專家協助下與國際接軌，並對區內其他地方的環境負責，亦為本港市民健康祝願！

此致

James Middleton

主席

各位立法會議員：

環境局局長黃錦星：

各大環保組織及團體：

環境局本末倒置，為擴堆填殺樹萬棵

將軍澳堆填區「環評報告」(EIA)嚴重過時及失誤，要求重做

環團同意將軍澳規劃出錯，要求環境局局長黃錦星立即向公眾解釋

A. 為擴堆填，環境局竟砍伐 10380 棵樹

據過往環境局為將軍澳堆填區所擬訂的環評報告(合約編號 CE 10/2005 及 CE45/99)，並無提及擴建將軍澳堆填區需要砍伐 10380 棵樹。即使在 2011 年西貢區議會及城市規劃委員會審議堆填區擴建及過往幾年的區議會紀錄，環境局亦無提及殺樹的情況，令人懷疑環境局存心隱瞞。

事實上，堆填區附近的居民已慘遭環境及空氣污染的問題影響，但環境局不單沒有製造樹肺補償居民，反而進行大規模砍伐樹木，將嚴重導致水土流失、空氣及環境進一步惡化。

環境局表示需砍伐的均為非珍貴樹種，但事實上樹木並沒有貴賤之分。「十年樹木，百年樹人」，環境局為擴堆填區所砍伐樹木正值壯健之年，加上所砍伐的數量是 10380 棵，完全地違反了環保原則。過往，曾有私人發展商砍伐樹木 250 棵被政府罰款數千萬元。然而，那私人發展商砍伐量與是次環境局相比實在是「小巫見大巫」，政府難辭其咎。

B. 兩份環評報告(EIA)指標過時及無反映可致癌數據(PM2.5)，理據不足

兩份將軍澳堆填區的環評報告分別為 2003 年及 2005 年制訂的。無論在人口、交通、民居距離等各方面，當年的情況與現時截然不同。今天，將軍澳堆填區距民居只有 800 米，距將軍澳工業邨(TVB 電視城、壹傳媒、香港電視等)更只有一街之隔，嚴重影響市民健康。

2005 年環評報告指出擴建堆填區時產生的塵埃對鄰近居民及「易受空氣污染影響的地方」(Air Sensitive Receivers, ASRs)並無大影響。環評報告指出: “there will be no adverse dust impacts to the identified ASRs” 事實上，環境保護署於 2003 及 2005 年進行的環境影響評估報告中，沒有就 PM2.5 所帶來的影響作出詳細評估。2013 年世界

衛生組織指出空氣中的懸浮粒子(Particulate Matters)屬致癌物，如肺癌。研究指出，當空氣中 PM2.5 的濃度長期高於 $10\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ，就會帶來死亡風險的上升，濃度每增加 $10\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ ，總死亡風險上升 4%，心肺疾病帶來的死亡風險上升 6%，肺癌帶來的死亡風險上升 8%。PM2.5 對人體健康的影響不容忽視，由於環評過時及未有反映可致癌物，為保障居民健康，環保署有必要重新評估堆填區對將軍澳居民所帶來的影響及重做合符世界標準的環評。

環保署當年 2003-2005 批准的環評（EIA）所根據的空氣質素指標落後，政府於 2013 已修定空氣質素指標，故此環評所依據的指標不切合現時環境，更嚴重落後於其他先進國家及地區。（見下表）

		各地標準				將軍澳堆填區 ASR 測試結果 2012 至 2014		
		2013 環保 署標 準	世界 衛生 組織 WHO	歐 盟	澳 洲	將軍澳 137 區入口	環保大道 (日出康城) 對開	坑口 常寧 遊樂場
可致癌污染物	2003-2005 環評報告 A) Scott Wilson B) ERM							
微細懸浮粒子 (PM2.5) 微克/立方米	沒有提供	75	10	25	25	200	140	90
與世衛(WHO)標準比較						超標 20 倍	超標 14 倍	超標 9 倍

環保組織 WGO 余遠騁也承認，將軍澳堆填區是規劃出錯。由於兩份環評報告嚴重過時、與事實脫節，更隱瞞了擴建需要殺樹逾萬棵的情況，將軍澳居民及地區人士一直要求環境局重新制訂新的環境評估。

C. 嘈音超標，環評失誤

環評報告表示堆填區運作時的日間嘈音介乎於 41dB(A)至 53dB(A)，夜間嘈音則介乎 33dB(A)至 47dB(A)，但主要嘈音來至重型車輛出入環保大道時產生。報告指出車輛行經環保大道時所產生的嘈音則較現時高不多於 1 分貝，並不符合事實。而根據實際量度，環保大道的噪音聲級曾分別錄得高達 65.7dB(A)及 67.7dB(A)。

D. 環境局在堆填區飽和年期亂篤數

根據環境局去年及今年向立法會提供的文件所示(文件 CB(1)1079/12-13(01)及(CB(1)931/13-14(01))(見下圖)，2011 年至 2012 年期間將軍澳堆填區耗用了 100 萬立方米容量，截至 2012 年年底還有剩餘 700 萬立方米的容量，加上環境局指未來數年的回收量將會增加，如此推算，將軍澳堆填區不可能在短期內飽和，環境局很大程度

在將軍澳堆填區的飽和年期上有亂篤數的情況。

在堆填區飽和年期上，環境局已多次欺騙了香港市民，更多次誇大擴建堆填區的迫切性，以「垃圾圍城」的虛言恫嚇環保團體、議員及市民，製造恐慌式的心理而迫使市民就範。事實上，全城推動減廢回收、做好配套及措施，比急於通過擴建堆填區更為迫切及重要。

環境局篤數，可以去到幾盡？

附註 A
CB(1) 1079/12-13(1)
2013 年 5 月 27 日

現有堆填區的
(如不進行擴建計劃)

	平均每日接收量 (2012 年) (公噸/日)	堆填容量		預計飽和年份 (註 1)
		設計 (百萬 立方米)	剩餘(截至 2011 年年底) (百萬 立方米)	
新界東南堆填區	都市固體廢物: 2,080 建築廢物: 2,320 其他廢物: 400	43	8	2014/15
新界東北堆填區	都市固體廢物: 1,940 建築廢物: 520 其他廢物: 220	35	19	2016/17
新界西堆填區	都市固體廢物: 5,260 建築廢物: 600 其他廢物: 500	61	33	2018/19
總計	都市固體廢物: 9,280 建築廢物: 3,440 其他廢物: 1,120	139	60	--

註 1: 儘管我們持續推動減廢回收，但在估算堆填區容量預計飽和年份時，我們仍須作若干規劃上的假設，以計及廢物量質量的變動。由於堆填區無廢物堆填區。

CB(1)931/13-14(01)
2014 年 2 月 24 日

現有堆填區的剩餘堆填容量
(如不進行擴建計劃)

	平均每日接收量 (2012 年) (單位: 公噸/日)	堆填容量		預計飽和年份 (註 1)	估計使用年限
		設計容量 (單位: 百萬 立方米)	剩餘容量 (截至 2012 年年底) (單位: 百萬 立方米)		
新界東南堆填區	都市固體廢物: 2,080 建築廢物: 2,320 其他廢物: 400	43	7	2015	2020 年 (5 年半)
新界東北堆填區	都市固體廢物: 1,940 建築廢物: 520 其他廢物: 220	35	18	2016/17	2033 年 (16 年半)
新界西堆填區	都市固體廢物: 5,260 建築廢物: 600 其他廢物: 500	61	31	2019	2033 年 (19 年)
總計	都市固體廢物: 9,280 建築廢物: 3,440 其他廢物: 1,120	139	56	--	

註 1: 儘管我們持續推動減廢回收，但在估算堆填區容量預計飽和年份時，我們仍須作若干規劃上的假設，以計及廢物量質量的變動。由於堆填區無廢物堆填區。

1 年用 1Mm³，唔擴建都可以用到 2020 ?!

E. 總結

1. 我們堅決反對環境局為擴堆填區竟濫殺樹木過萬棵。
2. 兩份環評報告(EIA)指標過時及並無反映可致癌數據(PM2.5)
3. 嘈音超標，環評失誤
4. 環境局在堆填區飽和年期亂篤數，盲推「三堆一爐」

根據以上有力的分析，政府為擴將軍澳堆填區，已多番隱瞞實際情況及數據，完全與事實不符。任何政團或環團，不應胡亂支持政府擴建將軍澳堆填區的不合理方案。若日後司法覆核推翻政府的錯誤缺失，閣下今天的投票，將承擔問責及蒙受千古罪人的惡名。



方國珊

終極關閉將軍澳堆填區大聯盟

2014年5月4日

副本送：

將軍澳屋苑大聯盟
維景灣畔業主委員會
都會駅業主委員會
君傲灣業主委員會
將軍澳中心 57 地段業主委員會
將軍澳中心 66 地段業主委員會
將軍澳中心 74 地段業主委員會
杏花邨業主委員會

清水灣半島業主立案法團
日出康城首都業主附屬委員會
天晉住宅業主小組委員會
寶盈花園業主立案法團
峻澄管業處
將軍澳工業邨各廠戶代表
清水灣冬泳團
小西灣藍灣半島業主委員會