

Four simple reasons the EPD should not be allowed to go ahead with their plans to build an super incinerator and extend landfills

1. Data

In a meeting between LIM & Christine Loh she confirmed that the only statistic that could be confirmed was the MSW collection data. We now know that the recycling data is completely inaccurate. Therefore the EPD do not know exactly how much waste is generated in Hong Kong nor do they know how much is truly recycled or by how much the total waste could be reduced by if Hong Kong did achieve the 52% recycling claimed. Under these circumstances it would be totally irresponsible to let these projects go ahead because the statistics they are based on are completely inaccurate.

2. The Plan

On the contrary if we trust the information provided by Christine Loh and the information presented in the EPD's Blue Print for Sustainable Use of Resources they claim their target for 2022 is to recycle 55% of the Waste in Hong Kong. Combine this with their target for waste reduction and it only leaves 3,110 tons per day to be disposed of. If this data is correct by the time the incinerator is completed there will hardly be sufficient waste to feed it. So why are EPD insisting on going ahead?

If the above data is not correct then the Blue Print for Sustainable Use of Resources must be viewed as seriously flawed and therefore can not be considered a serious response to Legco's rejection of the EPDs previous submissions

3. Technology

Of the various ways of solving waste problems the EPDs proposals represent the least advanced possible solutions.

1. There are no concrete proposals or timelines to implement waste reduction.
2. There are no concrete proposals for waste separation at source.
3. The plans only include the most minimal recycling facility (300 tonnes)
4. The proposed mass burn incinerator is the least advanced technology available. For example of the 89 proposed new MSW disposal facilities in the UK only 20 of them use mass burn technology. The rest use either Gasification, Pyrolysis, or Plasma Arc. Why do the EPD refuse to seriously consider any of these more advanced technologies?

4. Honesty and Transparency.

The EPD still have not told the public what their plan is to dispose of the 6,000 tpd of MSW not being burnt in the incinerator?

If the solution is a second incinerator where do they plan to locate it?

Why is this location not being considered for the first incinerator?

If the solution is not a second incinerator, what is it?

Simple questions but the EPD refuse to give clear answers. Therefore they should not be allowed to go ahead with their plans until they tell the public the whole story.

Finally I am absolutely certain everybody here who is speaking out against this plan is doing out of a genuine concern for the future of Hong Kong and the health and well being of its peoples. For the people speaking in favour of this plan I think the panel should ask some simple questions

1. Do you or your family live anywhere near any of the proposed landfill extensions or incinerators?
2. For academics. Do you or your department receive any funding for your research from government departments? If not have you done so in the past.
3. Do you or the company you represent stand to benefit in any way should this project go ahead?
4. Do the members of your organisation have any financial interest in this project going ahead.

I am sure anybody speaking against would be happy to answer the same questions.