

Index Page

Replies to supplementary written questions raised by Finance Committee Members in examining the Estimates of Expenditure 2017-18

Director of Bureau : Secretary for the Environment

Session No. : 11

File Name : ENB-2S-e1.doc

Reply Serial No.	Question Serial No.	Name of Member	Head	Programme
S-ENB01	S0033	KWOK Wai-keung	22	(2) Nature Conservation and Country Parks
S-ENB02	S0034	CHAN Tanya	44	(2) Air
S-ENB03	S0032	NG Wing-ka, Jimmy	44	(2) Air

CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY

S-ENB01

(Question Serial No. S0033)

Head: (22) Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Subhead (No. & title): (-) Not Specified

Programme: (2) Nature Conservation and Country Parks

Controlling Officer: Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
(Dr LEUNG Siu-fai)

Director of Bureau: Secretary for the Environment

Question:

- (a) According to the Director, the wild pig population will be controlled by neutering in the long term. When exactly will the relevant measures be implemented?
- (b) While the number of hunting operations carried out by the hunting teams has decreased, the number of wild pigs caught on Hong Kong Island and outlying islands is twice the number of hunting operations carried out. Does it indicate deterioration of wild pig problem in the districts concerned?

Asked by: Hon KWOK Wai-keung

Reply:

- (a) In mid-2017, the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) will launch a trial programme by introducing GonaCon™, a contraceptive drug for mammals, with a view to controlling the wild pig population in the long term. Under the programme, AFCD will deploy veterinary surgeons to assist in catching wild pigs by applying anaesthetics, inject the wild pigs with the contraceptive drug, and then release them back into the wild. AFCD will monitor the wild pig populations covered by the trial programme, in order to assess its effectiveness. Consultation with relevant experts and organisations, as well as the formulation of the implementation details of the trial programme are in progress.

It is our long-term goal to control the wild pig population by contraceptive measures. Upon completion of the trial programme, AFCD will review its effectiveness and consider the way forward. The finalised timetable is not yet available.

- (b) In general, wild pigs do not take the initiative to attack humans unless they have been frightened or provoked. As wild pigs may pose a threat to public safety, if the problem of wild pig nuisance persists and the preventive measures become ineffective, AFCD will consider notifying the hunting teams to conduct hunting operations, so as to properly eliminate the potential threat posed by the wild pigs to the public. The number of operations conducted by the wild pig hunting teams and the number of wild pigs caught vary depending on a number of factors, and bear no direct relation to each

other. According to AFCD's records, there is no sign of deterioration of wild pig problem on Hong Kong Island and outlying islands.

- End -

CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY

S-ENB02

(Question Serial No. S0034)

Head: (44) Environmental Protection Department

Subhead (No. & title): (-) Not Specified

Programme: (2) Air

Controlling Officer: Permanent Secretary for the Environment / Director of Environmental Protection (Donald TONG)

Director of Bureau: Secretary for the Environment

Question:

Regarding "Air pollutant emissions - Respirable suspended particulates (RSP) tonnes" in part b) of the reply, the emissions of many vehicles and vehicle types are 0. Would the Administration provide the information in a smaller measurement unit - gram? (ENB108)

Asked by: Hon CHAN Tanya (Member Question No. 40)

Reply:

In the reply to ENB108, the estimated respirable suspended particulates (RSP) emissions of some vehicle types are "0" for the following reasons:

- (1) owing to the small numbers of the relevant vehicles, their emissions will be "0" if indicated in tonnes and higher than "0" if indicated in grams; or
- (2) for Euro II and III diesel private cars registered but without licences (i.e. not allowed to run on roads), their estimated emissions are "0"; or
- (3) as the Euro V emission standards were not introduced until 2012, there was no emission from Euro V vehicles in 2010 and 2011; or
- (4) vehicles using liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) as fuel emit virtually no RSP. Their RSP emissions are generally estimated as "0".

The estimated RSP emissions in grams of various types of vehicles in Hong Kong from 2010 to 2014 are tabulated as follows.

Vehicle type	Exhaust emission standard	Air pollutant emissions ^{Note 1}				
		Respirable suspended particulates (RSP)(grams)				
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Petrol Private car	Pre-Euro	1 350 000	1 080 000	835 000	679 000	576 000
	Euro I	948 000	762 000	565 000	419 000 ^{Note 2}	317 000 ^{Note 2}
	Euro II	4 720 000	4 290 000	3 660 000	3 110 000	2 690 000
	Euro III	5 240 000	5 280 000	5 080 000	4 940 000	5 020 000
	Euro IV	3 610 000	4 650 000	5 230 000	5 670 000	6 470 000
	Euro V	0 ^{Note 3}	0 ^{Note 3}	366 000 ^{Note 2}	1 010 000	1 900 000
Diesel Private car	Pre-Euro	2 550 000	2 480 000	2 320 000	1 760 000	1 510 000
	Euro I	1 530 000	1 510 000	1 400 000	1 090 000	934 000
	Euro II	Euro II and III diesel private cars without licences (but registered) from 2010 to 2014				
	Euro III					
	Euro IV	174 000 ^{Note 2}	227 000 ^{Note 2}	225 000 ^{Note 2}	172 000 ^{Note 2}	140 000 ^{Note 2}
	Euro V	0 ^{Note 3}	0 ^{Note 3}	2 000 ^{Note 2}	20 000 ^{Note 2}	84 000 ^{Note 2}
Taxi	All Euro standards	Using LPG as fuel and emit virtually no RSP				
Motorcycle	Pre-Euro	1 330 000	1 190 000	1 010 000	843 000	719 000
	Euro I	7 970 000	7 180 000	6 220 000	5 260 000	4 550 000
	Euro II	No Euro II motorcycles were introduced (Skip directly from Euro I to Euro III)				
	Euro III	164 000 ^{Note 2}	244 000 ^{Note 2}	303 000 ^{Note 2}	362 000 ^{Note 2}	437 000 ^{Note 2}
	Euro IV	Euro IV motorcycles were not yet introduced				
Public light bus	Pre-Euro	3 580 000	2 170 000	1 540 000	1 360 000	974 000
	Euro I	36 900 000	34 100 000	32 500 000	26 700 000	20 700 000
	Euro II	46 100 000	45 300 000	44 600 000	37 800 000	35 600 000
	Euro III	28 900 000	17 900 000	23 400 000	20 700 000	24 100 000
	Euro IV	1 300 000	1 310 000	1 390 000	1 260 000	1 370 000
	Euro V	0 ^{Note 3}	0 ^{Note 3}	45 000 ^{Note 2}	144 000 ^{Note 2}	363 000 ^{Note 2}
Private light bus	Pre-Euro	2 230 000	2 220 000	1 870 000	1 680 000	933 000
	Euro I	2 310 000	2 370 000	2 080 000	1 790 000	1 370 000
	Euro II	1 440 000	1 560 000	1 290 000	1 190 000	1 050 000
	Euro III	897 000	1 030 000	782 000	743 000	635 000
	Euro IV	1 230 000	1 880 000	1 680 000	1 390 000	1 310 000
	Euro V	0 ^{Note 3}	0 ^{Note 3}	643 000	1 460 000	2 080 000
Light goods vehicle	Pre-Euro	84 000 000	74 400 000	63 800 000	50 900 000	27 500 000
	Euro I	57 700 000	54 900 000	50 900 000	43 700 000	26 900 000
	Euro II	46 400 000	44 400 000	41 000 000	34 300 000	27 300 000

Vehicle type	Exhaust emission standard	Air pollutant emissions ^{Note 1}				
		Respirable suspended particulates (RSP)(grams)				
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
	Euro III	23 800 000	23 800 000	23 700 000	21 500 000	21 000 000
	Euro IV	18 200 000	22 200 000	24 500 000	21 600 000	22 100 000
	Euro V	0 ^{Note 3}	0 ^{Note 3}	1 780 000	5 900 000	12 600 000
Medium goods vehicle	Pre-Euro	24 000 000	18 200 000	15 800 000	17 200 000	10 100 000
	Euro I	4 910 000	3 900 000	3 700 000	4 240 000	3 230 000
	Euro II	6 260 000	4 680 000	4 450 000	5 370 000	4 850 000
	Euro III	3 780 000	2 730 000	2 960 000	4 200 000	4 900 000
	Euro IV	3 060 000	3 390 000	3 570 000	3 980 000	4 160 000
	Euro V	0 ^{Note 3}	0 ^{Note 3}	550 000	1 710 000	3 560 000
Heavy goods vehicle	Pre-Euro	245 000 000	180 000 000	152 000 000	166 000 000	92 000 000
	Euro I	64 100 000	48 700 000	43 300 000	47 900 000	31 800 000
	Euro II	85 000 000	59 800 000	52 900 000	61 500 000	52 700 000
	Euro III	57 900 000	42 400 000	44 800 000	60 800 000	66 400 000
	Euro IV	11 300 000	12 100 000	12 900 000	14 700 000	18 500 000
	Euro V	0 ^{Note 3}	0 ^{Note 3}	1 770 000	6 130 000	12 000 000
Non-franchised public/private bus	Pre-Euro	7 750 000	7 360 000	7 810 000	7 170 000	6 080 000
	Euro I	4 190 000	3 220 000	2 100 000	2 160 000	1 390 000
	Euro II	17 600 000	12 400 000	8 110 000	5 170 000	4 780 000
	Euro III	24 900 000	22 600 000	22 400 000	22 300 000	18 000 000
	Euro IV	8 840 000	10 100 000	11 700 000	12 600 000	13 900 000
	Euro V	0 ^{Note 3}	0 ^{Note 3}	1 400 000	3 210 000	5 800 000

Note 1: The numbers are rounded to the nearest thousand and three significant figures are retained.

Note 2: Owing to the small numbers of the relevant vehicles, their emissions will be “0” if indicated in tonnes and higher than “0” if indicated in grams.

Note 3: The Euro V emission standards were introduced in 2012.

- End -

CONTROLLING OFFICER'S REPLY

S-ENB03

(Question Serial No. S0032)

Head: (44) Environmental Protection Department

Subhead (No. & title): (-) Not Specified

Programme: (2) Air

Controlling Officer: Permanent Secretary for the Environment / Director of Environmental Protection (Donald TONG)

Director of Bureau: Secretary for the Environment

Question:

This is a follow-up question on Reply Serial No. ENB138, in which the Administration responded that the cancellation of the full waiver of registration tax for electric private cars was due to the fact that electric vehicles had become increasingly acceptable to drivers and there had been a continuous rise in the number of registered private cars which would result in more congested road traffic. However, I noticed in the Government's reply that the number of electric private cars first registered in the past 3 years only accounted for a small percentage in the total number of private cars, up from 1.81% in 2014 to 7.33% in 2016. Therefore, electric private cars are not the main reason for traffic congestion. Instead, the cancellation of the full waiver of registration tax for electric private cars would make buyers switch to conventional petrol or diesel private cars, which is contrary to the Administration's policy of promoting the improvement of roadside air quality. Does the Administration agree that the cancellation of the full waiver of registration tax for electric private cars will lead to an increase in the number of registered conventional cars? If yes, why does the Administration still insist on cancelling the full waiver of registration tax for electric private cars?

Asked by: Hon NG Wing-ka, Jimmy (Member Question No. 38)

Reply:

The key policy consideration in promoting the use of electric vehicles (EVs) is to improve roadside air quality. Since commercial vehicles are the major source of roadside air pollution, encouraging the transport trades to replace conventional commercial vehicles with electric ones is a priority of the Government in promoting the use of EVs. Under the newly revised First Registration Tax (FRT) regime for EVs, the FRT of electric commercial vehicles will continue to be fully waived. In addition, the Pilot Green Transport Fund under the Environmental Protection Department will also help encourage the transport sector and non-profit organisations to test out green and innovative transport technologies for electric commercial vehicles.

For electric private cars, the Government has long adopted a public transport-oriented policy with railway as the backbone. There has been a continuous rise in the number of registered private cars in recent years. Heavy reliance on private cars for daily commute will lead to a worsening of the traffic congestion problem, which could also offset the efforts to improve roadside air quality. The Government believes that the revised FRT concessions for EVs can strike a right balance between promoting the use of EVs and avoiding the aggravation of the traffic congestion situation.

The new FRT concessions for EVs will end on 31 March 2018. The Government will review the FRT concession regime for EVs making reference to the relevant factors before then.

- End -