



EA Panel meeting today - proposal needs more careful consideration

Julia Brown to: info, klclegco, yanlee, jkstolegco, vfang,
tkwong, kp, albert.wychan, contact,
honstevengo, frankieyick, chiwaioffice,
Cc: panel_ea, info

24/02/2014 10:16

Dear Panel Member

I am very concerned with the proposal from the EPD

Bureau to reclaim land and build Integrated Waste Management Facilities (a large scale Incinerator) on land to be reclaimed off South Lantau.

It is my respectful hope that you can challenge and reject the proposal, based on true facts, rather than give it the official

endorsement needed to make progress.

SIX KEY QUESTIONS ON WASTE MANAGEMENT IN HONG KONG

1. The Bureau has admitted that their statistics for recycling are false and misleading. The previous claims that 48-52% of Hong Kong's waste is recycled have been shown to be incorrect. Waste being imported and re-exported without processing tonnage was previously added to the recycling figure but excluded from the waste generation figure. How can EPD be trusted on the Blueprint when it is based on such misleading and/or inadequate statistics?
2. Green Groups estimate that the true recycling percentage could be less than 10%. It is also clear from everyday observation that there is very little actual waste recycling in Hong Kong. The few "three-colour" recycling bins in use are mostly in obscure or difficult to get to locations, are too small and are badly designed, while the public is given no guidance on what types of plastic and paper waste can be recycled and what not to put in recycling bins. The recycling bins are often overflowing and remain so for days on end. Why is the EPD ignoring the strong demand from the public to recycle more waste and why are they not making much greater efforts at all levels to provide this most basic waste management infrastructure?
3. The EPD's strategy for the destruction of waste is based on sending unsorted waste to landfill or mass-burn incineration in a remote location. There are no intermediate steps between collection and dumping or burning. If the IWMF proposal is implemented, it will effectively rule out waste separation at source, intermediate stage sorting and the development of an effective recycling industry in Hong Kong. There will be no need for any of this if it can all just be burned. Why does the Blueprint contain no plans for sorting of waste to divert it away from landfill or incineration?

4. The large-scale incinerator will result in a net daily reduction in waste of 2,000 tonnes, while actually producing around 900 tonnes per day of highly toxic waste in the form of fly ash, which will still be sent to landfill. How can the huge economic and environmental cost of this IWMF be justified for such a small gain, which could be equally achieved through enhanced waste reduction and recycling?
5. Moving-grate incineration only achieves a 70% reduction in the amount of waste that is burned. This is at the expense of converting some of the waste into gases that contain poisonous dioxins which are pushed into the atmosphere, and by reducing the rest to a highly toxic ash residue. The claim that this is "Modern" incineration is simply not true. Why does the Bureau continue to resist other rapidly emerging technologies in the face of the growing evidence that these technologies are gaining acceptance around the world?
6. Why is the Bureau leading a delegation of LegCo Members to Europe to study incinerators and alternative technologies only after seeking approval for the out-dated mass-burn incinerator?

Yours sincerely,

Julia Brown