



12 March 2014

Special Meeting on Environmental Infrastructure Projects

22nd March 2014

Dear Panel Members,

Thank you for the opportunity for the Living Islands Movement to present our views on Waste Management. Five of the following questions were presented to all panel members prior to the meeting on 24 February. LIM have not received formal answers to these questions and we strongly believe that these fundamental issues must be responded to. The Panel on Environmental Affairs members and ideally Hong Kong public should be given the answers.

The issues are:

1. The Bureau has admitted that their statistics for recycling are false and misleading. The previous claims that as much as 52% of Hong Kong's waste is recycled have been shown to be incorrect. The tonnage of waste being imported and re-exported without processing was previously added to the recycling figure but excluded from the waste generation figure. **How can the EPD Blueprint be trusted when it is based on such misleading and false statistics?**

Why has there been no public review or amendment of the blueprint based on this new recycling rate information?

2. LIM estimates that the true recycling percentage could be less than 10%. You only need to look around to see how little actual waste recycling there is in Hong Kong. The EPD's recycling bins for

plastics, paper and metals are mostly inadequate for their intended use – being too small and badly designed, and the frequency of emptying the bins does not match the current rate of use by the community. Most Hong Kong residents are aware of the issues and want to take more responsibility for helping with recycling, especially food, plastics and metals. **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 the most basic waste management and resource recovery infrastructure?**

3. The EPD's strategy for removing the problem of waste is based on sending unsorted waste to landfill or burning. There are no intermediate steps between collection and dumping or burning. If the IWMF proposal is implemented, it will effectively make waste separation at source, intermediate stage sorting and the development of an effective recycling industry in Hong Kong redundant. There will be no incentive for the public to recycle or recover any waste if it can all be dumped into an incinerator and burned. This is not a strategy of a Responsible government. **Why does the Blueprint contain NO credible plans for sorting of waste to avoid the need for it to go to landfill or incineration?**
4. The large-scale incinerator proposed by the Bureau to manage 3,000 tonnes of waste per day will result in a net daily reduction in waste of around 2,000 tonnes, while actually producing around 900 tonnes per day of highly toxic waste in the form of fly ash, which is still be sent to landfill. **How can the huge economic and environmental cost of the IWMF be justified for such a small gain, which could be achieved at less social, environmental and financial cost through improving waste reduction and recycling?**
5. Moving-grate incineration only achieves a 70% reduction in the amount of waste that is burned, and the process converts some of the waste into poisonous dioxin gases that are emitted directly into the atmosphere, while the rest is reduced 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. What are the next phases planned by the ENB and when will the details be made public, as IWMF Phase 1 only deals with basically 1/3 of the current MSW volume.

Thank You
The Living Islands Movement