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The Chairman reminded members of the requirements under Rules 83A and 84 of the Rules of Procedure.

Item 1  — FCR(2017-18)63
RECOMMENDATION OF THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 31 JANUARY 2018

PWSC(2017-18)25
CAPITAL WORKS RESERVE FUND
HEAD 701 — LAND ACQUISITION
HEAD 702 — PORT AND AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT
HEAD 703 — BUILDINGS
HEAD 704 — DRAINAGE
HEAD 705 — CIVIL ENGINEERING
HEAD 706 — HIGHWAYS
HEAD 707 — NEW TOWNS AND URBAN AREA DEVELOPMENT
HEAD 708 (PART) — CAPITAL SUBVENTIONS
HEAD 709 — WATERWORKS
HEAD 710 — COMPUTERISATION
HEAD 711 — HOUSING
Block allocations

2. The Finance Committee ("FC") continued with the deliberation on FCR(2017-18)63. The Chairman advised that the item sought FC's approval of the recommendation made by the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") at its meeting held on 31 January 2018 regarding the proposal in PWSC(2017-18)25 for a total allocation of $12,491.9 million for
2018-2019 for the block allocation subheads under the Capital Works Reserve Fund.

3. The Chairman declared that he was an independent non-executive director of The Bank of East Asia.

4. The Chairman advised that at the previous meeting, he had already allowed a detailed discussion on the block allocations mechanism by members. He thus considered that members should focus on the funding proposal under this item at the present meeting. The Chairman also instructed that members who intended to propose motions under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure ("FCP") should submit their motions during the present meeting at or before 5:30 pm.

5. At the invitation of the Chairman, Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury spoke on the item. He said that it would be most important to obtain funding approval for the item before 1 April this year, or else, more than 9,000 on-going projects would have to be halted, possibly leading to breach of contracts, while more than 1,000 new projects scheduled to commence next year could not be activated. As most block allocations items were related to people's livelihood (such as landslip preventive works, drainage works or repairs of highways), severe impact on the general public would be created if the funding provisions were not approved on schedule. Moreover, the livelihood of numerous small and medium contractors would also be adversely affected.

6. Mr CHU Hoi-dick queried that FC had not scheduled any meetings since 2 March this year (i.e. the date of the last meeting) to avoid clashes with meetings of the Congress of the People's Republic of China as well as the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference. As a result, FC could not scrutinize the block allocations proposal thoroughly. He said that he hoped the same arrangement would not be repeated next year.

Head 702—Port and Airport Development

7. Noting that no provision was sought for all three subheads under Head 702—Port and Airport Development, Mr Jeremy TAM enquired about the reasons and whether the expenditure head would be deleted.

8. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) replied that the expenditure head was related to projects for the construction of the Hong Kong International Airport at Chek Lap Kok and the container terminals in earlier years. If there was
no new development after the completion of those projects, the Administration would consider the view put forth by Mr TAM.

**Head 703 Subhead 3004GX—Refurbishment of government buildings for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme**

**Item 006/18—Refurbishment of aviary cages no. 16, 18 and 19 in Hong Kong Zoological and Botanical Gardens**

9. Ms Claudia MO sought an explanation from the Administration as to why it cost over $6 million to construct the aviary cages. Ms MO was also concerned about the housing arrangement for birds living in the aviary cages during the construction period.

10. Director of Architectural Services ("D of ArchS") replied that the three aviary cases under the project occupied an area of 850 sq m. The project would also include works items such as repairing the ageing foundation and drainage system, altering the structure to enhance the bird-watching experience, greening works, etc. When drawing up the detailed design, the Architectural Services Department ("ArchSD") would discuss the housing arrangement for birds with the department(s) concerned.

   [Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]

**Item 164/18—Legislative Council Complex—Refurbishment of security systems**

11. In response to an enquiry made by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen on the above item, D of ArchS said that the relevant details would be provided after the meeting.

   [Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC230/17-18(01) on 12 April 2018.]

**Head 703 Subhead 3100GX—Project feasibility studies, minor investigations and consultants' fees for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme**
Item 187GK—The development of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department Animal Management and Animal Welfare Building Complex in Kai Tak Development—minor investigations and consultants' fees

12. Ms Claudia MO queried that the project estimate for the aforesaid item was on the high side and asked about the respective percentages of costs for investigations and consultants' fees.

13. D of ArchS advised that the item was a relatively large-scale project as it involved the re-provisioning of an animal management building with more than 10 storeys. About $1 million of the estimated cost was for investigations, and the remainder was consultants' fees. The estimated consultants' fees were calculated according to the established mechanism, and the percentage of such in relation to the cost of the main construction project was similar to that in other public works projects.

Head 703 Subhead 3101GX—Minor building works for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme

Fitting-out works at Hong Kong Jockey Club Drug InfoCentre

14. Mr SHIU Ka-chun was concerned about the details of the item. He considered that the Administration should inject new elements into the project, such as by providing the latest information on drugs or stepping up publicity for the Department of Health's harm reduction strategy. Mr SHIU requested the Administration to provide information on the current usage rate of the Hong Kong Jockey Club Drug InfoCentre.

15. D of ArchS advised that it was necessary to refurbish the Hong Kong Jockey Club Drug InfoCentre as it had been in operation for many years. ArchSD had been commissioned by the Narcotics Division of the Security Bureau to carry out the fitting-out works. ArchSD would maintain discussion with the Narcotics Division on how to implement the project.

Construction of visiting facility in Pik Uk Prison

16. Mr SHIU Ka-chun pointed out that given the inconvenience caused to members of the public who visited the prisoners as a result of the ageing existing facilities, it was necessary to refurbish the Pik Uk Prison by the provision of additional visiting facility, waiting room, electronic communications equipment, etc. He requested the Administration to provide detailed information on the visiting arrangement and additional
visitor reception capacity for the Pik Uk Prison upon completion of the project.

17. **D of ArchS** agreed with Mr SHIU’s statement that major refurbishment was due for the Pik Uk Prison, given that it had been in operation for many years. Subject to funding approval, ArchSD would liaise with the Correctional Services Department to ascertain the user requirements and refine the design to improve the visiting facilities.

   **Post-meeting note:** The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.

Head 705 Subhead 5101CX—Civil engineering works, studies and investigations for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme

Study on Technical Issues Related to Potential Reclamation Site at Ma Liu Shui—Consultants' fees

18. **Mr CHAN Chi-chuen** asked what the progress of the aforesaid study was, how the study findings would be made public and whether the study findings would be presented to the Panel on Development of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") for discussion. **Dr Fernando CHEUNG** called on the Administration to disclose the study report in full as soon as possible, so as to allow sufficient time for the stakeholders and the public to grasp the contents of the report. **Mr CHAN** called on the Administration to make available a Chinese version of either the study report or its executive summary.

19. **Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED")** stated that an executive summary of the aforesaid study report had already been published at the end of last year, while the full study report would be made available for public inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Code on Access to Information and uploaded onto the Internet in one to two months' time. The Administration planned to brief the District Councils ("DCs") and relevant organizations of the study findings and collect their views in the middle of this year before deciding on the way forward.

20. **Mr Gary FAN** expressed grave concern about the Ma Liu Shui reclamation project. He pointed out that it was a mega scale project with a reclamation extent of about 60 hectares, under which about 11 000 flats were expected to be constructed for a population of about 34 000, while some 42 000 employment opportunities would also be provided. He
questioned that the Administration had failed to take into account the said population growth and the resulting increase in traffic flow when studying the load of transport facilities in the area. Mr FAN considered that the Administration should abort the reclamation project and instead use the some 28 hectares of land made available after the relocation of Sha Tin Sewage Treatment Works for development.

21. In response, DCED pointed out that the Ma Liu Shui reclamation project would form a knowledge corridor with the nearby Hong Kong Science Park and become an employment node providing a large number of employment opportunities. The Administration was aware of and attached great importance to the local transport problem. If the idea of an employment node was put to implementation, local residents were expected to work in the area, thus reducing both inflow and outflow of traffic. As a result, the load on the transport network of Sha Tin could be alleviated.

22. Mr Alvin YEUNG said that residents in Sha Tin and Ma On Shan generally objected to the Ma Liu Shui reclamation project and criticized the Administration for inadequate assessment and consultation on the project. He pointed out that it was the Administration's intention to bundle the handling of land resulting from the Ma Liu Shui reclamation project and the relocation of Sha Tin Sewage Treatment Works, and the Administration would later consult the Panel on Development on the latter project and submit the relevant funding proposal to FC. He asked how the Administration would follow up the matter if the item on the relocation of Sha Tin Sewage Treatment Works was not supported by LegCo, and whether there was a fallback plan. Expressing similar concerns, Mr Gary FAN also queried that the Administration had ignored the opposition view expressed by the District Council on the Ma Liu Shui reclamation project.

23. In response, DCED pointed out that it was the Administration's hope that holistic consideration would be given to reclamation outside Victoria Harbour after completion of the preliminary technical feasibility studies on various options. Regarding the Ma Liu Shui reclamation, as the identified site was next to the existing Sha Tin Sewage Treatment Works, it would be more effective to conduct technical studies covering both sites. The Administration would consider the matter again if the Sha Tin Sewage Treatment Works relocation proposal was not supported by LegCo.

24. Mr Gary FAN said that it was necessary for the Administration to raise the embankment of Shing Mun River as a result of flooding caused by Typhoon HATO earlier. If the Ma Liu Shui reclamation project was to be implemented, the drainage situation of Shing Mun River might be further
affected, resulting in the need for the river embankment to be raised even further. He asked whether this matter would also be studied under the above item.

25. DCED and Director of Drainage Services stated that potential drainage problems caused by the Ma Liu Shui reclamation project had indeed been examined under the aforesaid study. The Administration was of the view that the project should not have any material impact on Shing Mun River.

Pier Improvement Programme

26. Mr YIU Si-wing said that under the Administration's ongoing Pier Improvement Programme ("PIP"), 10 public piers in the New Territories ("NT") and the Islands District would be covered under the first phase of the programme. Noting the provision of about $14 million earmarked for pier improvement at Lai Chi Wo and Tung Ping Chau, he enquired about the timetable for commencement of improvement works for the remaining eight public piers.

27. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired about the criteria adopted by the Administration for the selection of piers for improvement. He opined that some ferry routes in need of improvement were not covered under the first phase of PIP, such as the route between Ma Wan to Tsuen Wan and Po Toi Public Pier.

28. DCED pointed out that apart from the above item, items relating to the remaining eight public piers were also covered by the block allocations subhead of 5101CX under Head 705. The Administration had set up the Committee on Piers to select the piers for improvement, taking into account factors such as public safety concerns, accessibility of nearby scenic attractions, requests from locals, utilization and technical feasibility. The Administration noted the views expressed by Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung.

29. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that the footpath connecting Po Toi Public Pier and Tai Wan in the centre of the island was rugged and difficult to transverse. Notwithstanding the long years of efforts made by local residents for improvement works of the footpath, the Administration had yet to respond to their request positively. He referred to the previous response given by the Home Affairs Department that the relevant works could not be undertaken because the estimated cost was about $50 million. Mr LEUNG requested the Administration to provide written information concerning the relocation or redevelopment of Po Toi Pier, including the responsible government department, as well as the actions taken by the
Administration to follow up on views expressed by LegCo Members after an earlier site visit there.

30. In response, DS(Tsy)3 said that the Administration would provide supplementary information on the project referred to by Mr LEUNG after the meeting. He pointed out that generally speaking, if the estimated cost of proposed works exceeded $30 million (i.e. the project ceiling of individual items under block allocations), funding approval would have to be sought from FC separately. Meanwhile, the relevant advanced feasibility studies and investigation works could be carried out through the block allocations. When selecting the piers for improvement works, the Administration would take into account a host of factors.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]

Item 5H92CL—Technical study on transport infrastructure at Kennedy Town for connecting to East Lantau Metropolis

31. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked why the item was still included under the block allocations proposal even though no estimated cost was incurred for 2018-2019.

32. Mr AU Nok-hin pointed out that the project was controversial because under the proposed transport infrastructure at Kennedy Town for connecting to East Lantau Metropolis, Western District Public Cargo Working Area would be used as a connection point, thus affecting the harbourfront along Kennedy Town. He called on the Administration to thoroughly review the impact of the project on the community's reception capacity as well as the transport carrying capacity and fully consult the local residents on the project.

33. DCED stated that the above item was meant to study whether it was technically feasible to construct transport infrastructure at Kennedy Town for connecting to East Lantau Metropolis without causing significant impact on land use development at Kennedy Town. The study had already been completed, and the executive summary of the study report had also been uploaded onto the department's website. As payment for the item had yet to be settled, the item could not be deleted from the block allocations proposal. The Administration would launch public consultation on the project in due course, and consideration would definitely be given to the implications for Kennedy Town.
34.  **Mr AU Nok-hin** was concerned about the progress of the above two items. He said that the direction of developing the land created by proposed near shore reclamation at Sunny Bay for a thematic leisure and entertainment area was controversial and queried whether the Administration had assessed the attractiveness of a thematic leisure and entertainment area for tourists. **Mr AU** held that instead of creating land by reclamation, the Administration should comprehensively review the land use of Sunny Bay and its nearby areas and consider using the land reserved for Phase 2 development of the Hong Kong Disneyland for the construction of residential units.

35.  In response, **DCED** pointed out that the items mentioned by Mr AU Nok-hin were both sub-projects under the "Enhancing Land Supply Strategy: Reclamation Outside Victoria Harbour and Rock Cavern Development" proposal put forth by the Government in 2011. While the Engineering Feasibility Studies for Proposed Near Shore Reclamation at Sunny Bay could hopefully commence later this year, the Engineering Feasibility Studies for Proposed Near Shore Reclamation at Siu Ho Wan had been completed last year, and the executive summary of the study report had also been uploaded onto the Internet. During the consultation on Lantau development completed last year, the Government noted the view that land created from near shore reclamation at Sunny Bay could be used towards the development of a thematic leisure and entertainment area. While the attractiveness of the said development mode for tourists would be examined under the proposed planning and engineering study for near shore reclamation at Sunny Bay, the Administration would also launch public consultation accordingly.

**Item 5H23CL—Engineering Feasibility Studies for Proposed Near Shore Reclamation at Siu Ho Wan and item 5H24CL—Engineering Feasibility Studies for Proposed Near Shore Reclamation at Sunny Bay**

36.  In response to an enquiry made by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen on the contents of the aforesaid item, **Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Infrastructure)** said that as a result of the climatic conditions in winter, marine refuse would be accumulated at the southern tip of Shek O Bay. However, as the waters in the area were
Action

rough and choppy, staff of the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department could only access there by sea to clean up the refuse during the months of June to September each year. The above item was meant to study whether it was feasible to provide land access to the area for cleaning up the refuse.

Community Green Stations

37. Mr AU Nok-hin queried the effectiveness of environmental projects undertaken by the Administration. He pointed out that while the Administration had previously indicated its intention to develop a recycling station in the Southern District, the plan had yet to materialize. Mr AU requested the Administration to elaborate on the results achieved so far by various Community Green Station ("CGS") projects under Head 705 Subhead 5101DX. He also called on the Administration to review the relevant policy in a timely manner.

38. In response, Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Management Policy) pointed out that the Administration had been striving to develop CGSs in various districts, and CGSs in 5 of the 18 districts had already commenced operation. In addition, CGS projects in two districts (Tuen Mun and Kwai Tsing) would be finalized soon. Regarding the development of CGS in the Southern District, the Administration was aware that the Southern DC might not agree with the currently identified site. Hence, the Administration would find other suitable sites and consult the views of DC accordingly. Of CGSs operating in the five districts, the Sha Tin CGS and the Eastern CGS had already been opened to the public for more than three years, and the volume of recyclables collected had exceeded the contract requirement (i.e. not less than 600 tonnes within three years). For the other three CGS projects (in Kwun Tong, Yuen Long and Sham Shui Po) which had just commenced operation for about a year, the volume of recyclables collected was also on target (320 tonnes for Kwun Tong CGS and 380 tonnes for Yuen Long CGS). Apart from the development of recycling stations, the CGS projects would also launch public education initiatives in collaboration with district organizations.

Head 705 Subhead 5001BX—Landslip preventive measures

39. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the arrangement for different packages of projects under the above subhead, as well as the details of a trial in Sham Tseng Sun Tsuen for the use of real-time landslide monitoring equipment. DCED advised that instead of mandatorily requiring that projects in individual districts be put under the same package, the Administration would expeditiously take forward different packages of
projects after their design had been finalized. Hence, projects created in different years might also be carried out concurrently. Regarding the trial in Sham Tseng Sun Tsuen for the use of real-time landslide monitoring equipment, as well as the installation locations, the Administration would provide the relevant supplementary information after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]

Head 706 Subhead 6100TX—Highway works, studies and investigations for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme

Item 64NRH78X—Application of Joint Sealant for Paving Blocks at Footpath in Tung Chung and
Item 64NRJ95X—Application of Joint Sealant to Paving Blocks in Tin Shui Wai, Yuen Long

40. Regarding the above two items, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned that the application of joint sealant for paving blocks might impede the growth of trees on footpaths. He thus enquired about the criteria of applying joint sealant to paving blocks.

41. Deputy Director of Highways ("DDHy") advised that as a general rule, the department would apply joint sealant to strengthen the paver blocks under the following circumstances:

(a) roads with subsidence of a relatively serious nature;

(b) footpaths that were frequently used and washed;

(c) footpaths affected by illegal pavement parking; and

(d) footpaths with a relatively fast growth of weeds.

He also pointed out that as planters would provide sufficient air and water for the roots of trees growing on footpaths, the trees would not be affected by the joint sealant.

Item 67NRC00I—Reconstruction of EVA with concrete paving blocks and footpath at Mui Wo Rural Committee Road

42. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired about the progress of the item. He pointed out that although the road section was a restricted area where no
vehicles should enter, the emergency vehicle access there was always fully parked with other vehicles.

43. DDHy advised that the above project had largely been completed in 2015. While the Administration had already convened inter-departmental meetings to study the arrangements for the restricted road section, the way forward had yet to be finalized. As the restricted area order was still in force, the police would take enforcement actions accordingly.

44. Mr CHU Hoi-dick requested the Administration to provide supplementary information setting out the management plan for the said restricted road section.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]

Item R&D1—Review of potential hazards in Hong Kong road network

45. Mr Jeremy TAM sought details about the above item. He also asked whether similar reviews had been conducted previously.

46. DDHy replied that currently, more than 2,000 kilometres of highway was under the management of the Highways Department ("HyD"). Under the item, the department would review and enhance the road safety facilities. HyD would review the current condition and traffic flow of the roads and instruct the consultant to make film recordings of the roads in day and night time in order to identify the sections where enhancement to safety facilities was required. The entire project was expected to take two and a half years to complete. Although a similar comprehensive review was last undertaken more than 10 years ago, the department had also conducted regional reviews with follow-up actions from time to time. HyD would make reference to the experience in other places when implementing the project.

Head 707 Subhead 7100CX—New towns and urban area works, studies and investigations for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme

Item 7E78TS—Preliminary Feasibility Study of Traffic and Transport for Lantau, Coastal Road between Tung Chung and Tai O and Connection between North Lantau and Mui Wo

47. Mr Holden CHOW was concerned about the transport connectivity between North and South Lantau. He asked whether the provision of
additional road link between North and South Lantau would be studied under the item.

48. DCED replied that apart from the coastal road between Tung Chung and Tai O, the item would also study the road link between Mui Wo and Tai O which had been aborted earlier.

Item 7E17RS—Pilot Scheme of Provision of Underground Bicycle Parking System—Investigation and

Item 7E44CL—Study on Land Requirements for Construction Industry

49. Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked when the consultancy reports of the above two items would be published. He also asked why the actual costs of the two studies were substantially lower than the estimated costs.

50. DCED advised that the tender prices of the two studies were both lower than the estimates. Of the two studies, the Study on Land Requirements for Construction Industry would be completed soon, and the findings would be made public in accordance with the requirements under the Code on Access to Information.

Item 7E39RO—Feasibility Study on Cycle Track Network in Kai Tak Development

51. Mr Jeremy TAM called on the Administration to make planning for the provision of more bicycle parking spaces in government buildings in the Kai Tak Development Area ("KTDA") to dovetail with the development of cycle track networks.

52. DCED advised that the aim of the above item was to widen the coverage of the cycle track network in KTDA to include various major locations and facilities (such as stations and the cruise terminal) for recreation and open space uses. In response to an enquiry made by Mr TAM, the Administration would provide supplementary information after the meeting setting out the coverage of the cycle track network in KTDA and whether it would connect the proposed Inland Revenue Tower and other government buildings.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]
Place-making at Ma Wan Chung, Tung Chung

53. **Mr CHU Hoi-dick** enquired about the details and progress of the item. Pointing out that the Ma Wan Chung improvement project (including a waterfront promenade connecting Ma Wan Chung with the town centre, village sewerage works, etc.) had been mentioned in a paper of the Islands DC, he enquired about the relationship between the two items. He was also concerned whether the Administration would apply for funding for the relevant projects again.

54. **DCED** replied that "Place-making at Ma Wan Chung, Tung Chung" was originated from the suggestions made by local people for improving the ancillary facilities and streetscape of Ma Wan Chung in the context of the Government's consultation during 2011 for the Tung Chung New Town Extension. The Administration would provide the relevant supplementary information after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]

Study on the Revitalization of Disused Ferry Piers in Victoria Harbour

55. **Mr CHU Hoi-dick** enquired about the number and location of ferry piers covered under the above item.

56. **DCED** replied that about two ferry piers were covered under the item, one of which was the Kowloon City Ferry Pier.

Technical Study on Potential Sites for Relocation of Wholesale Markets and for Other Industrial uses in North West Tsing Yi

57. In response to an enquiry made by Mr CHU Hoi-dick, **DCED** undertook to provide a list of wholesale markets related to the item on "Technical Study on Potential Sites for Relocation of Wholesale Markets and for Other Industrial uses in North West Tsing Yi" under Head 707 Subhead 7100CX.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]
Item KC-DMW453—Construction of a pet garden in Sheung Shing Street Park

58. Ms Claudia MO criticized the Administration's animal policy for separating human beings from animals, which ran contrary to the principle of inclusion. She enquired about the details of the item.

59. Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department advised that under the item, a pet garden would be constructed inside the Sheung Shing Street Park, including the installation of railings, pets' activity area, notice board, double gate, hand-washing basin, dog excreta collection bin, etc. The project was estimated to cost about $2 million and was expected to be completed by the first quarter of this year.

Head 708 Subhead 8001SX—Provisioning of welfare facilities

60. In response to an enquiry made by Mr Holden CHOW, DS(Tsy)3 and Chief Executive Officer (Subventions/Planning), Social Welfare Department advised that the projects concerning the provision of an early education and training centre, as well as an office base for Integrated Support Service for Persons with Severe Physical Disabilities in the public housing development at Chung Nga Road East, Tai Po had already been included in the full snapshot list of all the items proposed to be funded under each of the block allocations subheads for 2018-2019 and would be funded under Subhead 8001SX. The said snapshot list had already been deposited with the LegCo Secretariat.

61. Dr Fernando CHEUNG requested the Administration to account for the road safety and accessibility impacts of the public housing development at Chung Nga Road East, Tai Po on various social welfare facilities in Pinehill Village, as well as the improvement measures to be implemented. In response, Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau said that the Administration would maintain communication with Hong Chi Association, the operator of the said facilities, on the relevant projects to ensure that suitable arrangements would be made. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide supplementary written information on the item.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]
Item 710 Subhead A007GX—New Administrative Computer Systems

62. **Mr Tony TSE** noted that many items under Head 710 were concerned with the engagement of consultants for conducting feasibility studies or system development. He asked whether the procurement of hardware was covered under the relevant estimates. **Mr TSE** was also concerned that as a long time was needed for hardware procurement under the Government's general procurement procedures, the procured hardware might not necessarily be the most advanced in the market. He thus called on the Administration to streamline the procedures, with a view to expediting the procurement of computer hardware.

63. **Chief Systems Manager (Governance and Resources), Office of the Government Chief Information Officer** advised that from time to time, consultants would be engaged by government departments for feasibility studies and reports on how to improve their businesses through information technology, and the cost of hardware procurement would be excluded from the relevant estimates. The government departments concerned would only proceed with hardware procurement in accordance with the development needs after completion of the relevant feasibility studies. The Administration noted Mr TSE's views and would strive to expedite the hardware procurement process.

---

Item 16—Upgrade of e-Application for Ad Hoc Quotas for Cross Boundary Private Cars and Lantau Closed Road Permit

64. **Mr CHU Hoi-dick** requested the Administration to account for the objectives and implementation timetable of the item. **DS(Tsy)3** undertook to provide the relevant supplementary information after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]

Item 85—Unmanned Aerial Vehicle and Training Workstations (Survey and Mapping Office)

65. **Mr Jeremy TAM** enquired about the mode and contents of training programmes provided under the above item, as well as the number of benefactors per annum, and whether the training would be conducted by organizations outside the Government.

66. **Chief Systems Manager (Governance and Resources), Office of the**
Government Chief Information Officer advised that the item was intended to procure and upgrade computer workstations for analyzing data collected by unmanned aerial vehicles. It was expected that training would be provided to several dozens of persons. The Administration would provide supplementary information after the meeting on details of the relevant training, including the programme and type of vehicles to be adopted.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]

Item 349—Provision of Mobile Applications of "A Symphony of Lights"

67. Mr AU Nok-hin questioned the low effectiveness of the mobile applications of "A Symphony of Lights". He was concerned that the download and usage rates of the mobile applications were on the low side.

68. Chief Systems Manager (Governance and Resources), Office of the Government Chief Information Officer advised that the mobile applications of "A Symphony of Lights" aimed at adding soundtracks to the performance to increase the engagement of spectators. The Administration understood Mr AU's concern, and the Office of the Government Chief Information Officer would call on all government departments from time to time to pay attention to the download and usage rates when developing mobile applications.

Head 711 Subhead B100HX—Minor housing development related works, studies and investigations for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme

Item HB1521—Site formation and infrastructural works for public housing development at Pok Fu Lam South—design and investigation

69. Mr AU Nok-hin said that the above item was related to the revised proposal of moving the Wah Fu Estate redevelopment southwards, to which many views had been expressed by the public. He requested the Administration to elaborate on the progress of the relevant work and suitably respond to public views on the revised proposal of moving the Wah Fu Estate redevelopment southwards.

70. Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau advised that the rezoning applications for the above project had already been submitted to the Town Planning Board, and the relevant government departments were now actively conducting
communication with the stakeholders to address their demands.

*Item HB1415—Site formation and infrastructural works for public housing development at Chung Nga Road and Area 9, Tai Po—design and investigation*

71. Mr AU Nok-hin criticized that the traffic impact assessment ("TIA") for the public housing development at Chung Nga Road and Area 9, Tai Po had failed to adequately assess the impact of such on vehicular flows in Tai Po district. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting also pointed out that the bottleneck of traffic congestion in NT East was the section of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) near Sha Tin Town Centre as many vehicles would travel to and from the town centre through that road section. However, as TIA for the project had only taken into account the traffic conditions within Tai Po district, it could not possibly help resolve the traffic congestion in NT East. Mr AU and Mr LAM called on the Administration to conduct a comprehensive regional TIA for the project.

72. DCED and Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau took note of the views expressed by the Members. While the scope of TIA for the project was confined to those areas covered under the development plan, improvements had been suggested to address the traffic impact of such within the areas. Apart from the aforesaid TIA, the Transport Department had conducted other assessments on the traffic conditions of Tai Po district. To address the traffic congestion in the section of Tai Po Road (Sha Tin Section) near Sha Tin Town Centre, the Administration had already proposed a works project to widen the particular road section. The proposed project which had already obtained support from the Panel on Development of LegCo would be submitted to PWSC for consideration in due course.

73. Mr CHU Hoi-dick referred to the report of the Technical Study on Reclamation at Lung Kwu Tan which pointed out that due to the problem of air pollution, the area was not suitable for residential development; instead, it was more suitable to use the area for the development of waterborne transport industry. As the provision of industrial land had already been planned in a number of new development areas and the traffic flow at Lung Kwu Tan Road had already become saturated, he asked whether the Administration would consider shelving the proposed reclamation at Lung Kwu Tan.

74. In response, DCED pointed out that the Administration was now considering the direction of follow-up work.
Agricultural Park (Phase 1)

75. Dr KWOK Ka-ki criticized that the Administration's New Agriculture Policy ("NAP") lacked transparency, and the policy was implemented arbitrarily without thoroughly consulting the views of the farmers. Moreover, the Administration had resumed land for the development of the Agricultural Park ("Agri-Park") and high-technology farming industry, thereby evicting active farmers from their farms and stifling the local agricultural industry. Dr Fernando CHEUNG called on the Administration to respect the local farmers who relied on agriculture for their livelihood when developing Agri-Park.

76. In response, Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation ("DAFC") pointed out that the Administration had already conducted extensive consultation on NAP over a long period of time, and many views had been collected. At present, the Administration was taking forward the development of Agri-Park (Phase 1). In this regard, the Administration had contacted all the farmers affected by the development to take heed of their demands. The Administration would strive to ensure that all the farmers concerned would be relocated to Agri-Park to continue farming.

77. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that the Government had already published in the Gazette the construction of a dual two-lane carriageway for Agri-Park (Phase 1), yet Tsiu Keng Road to which it connected was a single lane two-way carriageway. He asked whether the Administration would only consider the widening of Tsiu Keng Road after completion of Agri-Park (Phase 1). He also requested the Administration to consult the villagers living in the area. Dr Fernando CHEUNG also expressed similar concerns and called on the Administration to minimize the resumption of agricultural land for the road works and ensure a seamless transition for the affected farmers to continue farming in Agri-Park, so as to prevent any adverse impact on their livelihood.

78. Mr James TO was concerned that the development of Agri-Park might destroy the local farming atmosphere. He also said that some existing farmers operating in the area were worried about the need to pay a high cost for the use of Agri-Park facilities, such that they could no longer make a profit through farming activities.

79. DCED replied that since the gazettal of the relevant road construction works, the Administration had so far received about 50 objections. Taking into account the public's views, the Administration would reconsider whether the alignment of the carriageway could be adjusted. When taking forward the Agri-Park (Phase 2) development, the
Administration would examine whether Tsiu Keng Road should be widened and conduct consultation accordingly, but a decision on the matter had yet to be finalized at this stage. DAFC supplemented that while a lot of farmland within the boundary of Agri-Park had been left fallow, it was still suitable for farming. Hence, the Administration hoped that in tandem with the development of Agri-Park, the water quality and soil in the area could be improved to better support agricultural activities, while ancillary infrastructural facilities in the area could also be enhanced.

80. **Mr CHU Hoi-dick** called on the Administration to take forward the Agri-Park development under the principle of zero land resumption to ensure that no impact would be caused to the homes of villagers in the area. Dr Fernando CHEUNG called on the Administration to establish a procedure to give notice to the local residents as early as possible when conducting feasibility studies in future for development projects which necessitated land resumption and destruction to their villages.

81. In response, **DS(Tsy)3** said that the Administration noted the members' views and would strive to make reference to Dr CHEUNG's view before conducting the feasibility studies. DAFC pointed out that it was all along the Administration's policy to minimize land resumption for development projects. Nonetheless, during the development process, there might be some cases where land resumption was unavoidable. The Administration had been maintaining routine communication with the dozen or so farmers affected by the works, and it had also undertaken to relocate the farmers concerned to Agri-Park (Phase 1) to continue farming and provide them with technical support to enhance productivity.

82. **Mr Steven HO** considered that the Administration should plan and develop Agri-Park with a new mindset, so that more infrastructural facilities could be provided for the farmers. He called on the Administration to properly address the needs of the affected farmers during the transitional period after resumption of agricultural land for the Agri-Park development, including calculating suitable compensation payments to the farmers affected by land resumption on the basis of the value of their agricultural production. **DAFC** noted Mr HO's views. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick were concerned about the respective ratios of land earmarked for conventional, organic and high-technology farming operations within Agri-Park. Members also enquired about the total floor area of Agri-Park in future, as well as the area of hard surfaces in the connecting road. **Dr CHEUNG** was concerned whether leisure agriculture would be developed in Agri-Park.

83. **DAFC** replied that different types of agriculture with potential
productivity would be developed in Agri-Park. Currently, the Administration was undertaking the planning and design of Agri-Park. Under the initial plan, land in the upstream area would be used for organic farming operations, while land in the downstream area would be reserved for conventional farming operations, so as to avoid the risk of water source for organic farming being contaminated by pesticides used in conventional farming. Meanwhile, land in the midstream area could be used for high-technology farming operations, so as to segregate the former two types of farming operations. In addition, given the Administration's belief that educating the next generation would be most important to the development of the agricultural industry, an education centre and visitors' facilities would also be provided inside Agri-Park. But as the detailed planning and design had yet to be finalized, no information was available on matters such as the floor area and connecting road as requested by members. Moreover, there was no intention to develop leisure farms in Agri-Park.

Other concerns

84. Dr Junius HO questioned that the Administration had been relying on outside consultants excessively, such that the ratio of consultants' fees to total project cost for many projects was on the high side. He held that the relevant project staff in the Government should possess adequate professional knowledge and play a larger role in striving to take forward the projects.

85. Ms Claudia MO and Mr CHU Hoi-dick criticized the Administration for conniving with the charging of exorbitant consultants' fees by the project consultants.

86. In response, DS(Tsy)3 said that the Administration noted the views expressed by members and undertook to engage consultants only when necessary. That said, as project staff in the Government were invariably required to undertake a number of projects concurrently, it would be necessary to engage consultants for assistance from time to time. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide supplementary information setting out the principles to be followed when deciding whether consultants would be engaged to take forward works projects, so as to respond to the concerns expressed by members about the excessively high consultants' fees in works projects.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC278/17-18(01) on 6 June 2018.]
Arrangement of scrutiny of this item

87. At 4:48 pm, the Chairman reminded members that in case they intended to propose motions under FCP 37A ("FCP 37A motions"), they should submit the motions during the present meeting at or before 5:30 pm.

88. At 4:58 pm, the Chairman declared that the meeting be suspended. The meeting resumed at 5:11 pm.

89. At 5:57 pm, the Chairman said that he was of the view that the item had been thoroughly discussed and instructed that a line be drawn for the questioning session. He asked members who intended to continue speaking on the item to indicate their intention to speak. FC would then conclude the questioning session after all members who had requested to speak had spoken and proceed to voting on whether the FCP 37A motions should be proceeded with.

Motions proposed by members under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure

90. FC started to vote on whether the FCP 37A motions should be proceeded with forthwith. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. After the Chairman announced that FC had decided not to proceed with forthwith the first FCP 37A motion, Mr CHAN Hak-kan moved without notice under FCP 47 that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of any motions or questions under the same agenda item, FC should proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell had been rung for one minute. The Chairman put the motion to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division, and the division bell was rung for five minutes. The Chairman announced that the motion was passed, and the votes of individual members were set out in the Annex. FC continued with the voting on the whether the remaining FCP 37A motions should be proceeded with forthwith. The voting results were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members proposing the motions</th>
<th>Serial numbers of motions</th>
<th>Motions be proceeded with forthwith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr CHAN Chi-chuen</td>
<td>0001</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gary FAN</td>
<td>0002</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr AU Nok-hin</td>
<td>0003</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91. The Chairman reminded Mr Gary FAN that he should not make any
other statements when reading out the wording of the FCP 37A motion, or he would consider whether members who proposed FCP 37A motions should be allowed to read out the wording of the motions when the bell was ringing for divisions being claimed for the questions put.

**Voting on FCR(2017-18)63**

92. There being no further questions from members, the Chairman put item FCR(2017-18)63 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. The Chairman declared that 36 members voted in favour of and 8 members voted against the item, and 1 member abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

**For:**
- Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan
- Ms Starry LEE Wai-king
- Mr WONG Kwok-kin
- Mr Michael TIEN Puk-sun
- Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming
- Mr MA Fung-kwok
- Mr CHAN Han-pan
- Mr Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung
- Mr Martin LIAO Cheung-kong
- Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok
- Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin
- Mr HO Kai-ming
- Mr SHIU Ka-fai
- Ms YUNG Hoi-yan
- Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
- Mr LUK Chung-hung
- Mr Kenneth LAU Ip-keung
- Mr Vincent LAU Wing-shun
(36 members)

**Against:**
- Ms Claudia MO
- Mr Alvin YEUNG
- Dr CHENG Chung-tai
- Mr Gary FAN Kwok-wai
(8 members)

**Abstained:**
- Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
(1 member)
93. The Chairman declared that the item was approved by FC.

Item 2 — FCR(2017-18)64
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 10 JANUARY 2018

EC(2017-18)11
HEAD 44 — ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DEPARTMENT
Subhead 000 — Operational expenses

94. The Chairman advised that the item sought FC's approval of the recommendation made by the Establishment Subcommittee at its meeting held on 10 January 2018 regarding the proposal in EC(2017-18)11 for the creation of one permanent post of Assistant Director of Environmental Protection in the Environmental Protection Department ("EPD") with effect from the date of approval by FC to lead the Waste Reduction and Recycling Division ("WRD") in EPD, so as to provide dedicated staffing support at the directorate level on a permanent basis to implement the on-going measures and formulate new initiatives to promote waste reduction and recycling.

Targets of waste reduction and recycling policies

95. Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Mr AU Nok-hin criticized that while the Administration had been rolling out various waste reduction and recycling initiatives, it had yet to formulate specific targets for the relevant work. Mr AU queried that since its implementation, the CGS initiative had yet to achieve any significant results. He suggested that the Administration could adopt the target of collecting 1 tonne of recyclables per day as the target of the CGS initiative and step up publicity accordingly.

96. Mr CHAN Hak-kan considered that the Administration should formulate clear targets for its waste reduction and recycling policies, so as to be accountable to the public.

97. In response, Under Secretary for the Environment ("USEN") pointed out that currently, Hong Kong's recyclables would mostly be exported to the Mainland. However, as the Mainland had tightened its import policy on recyclables in recent years, Hong Kong's recycling industry would need to be transformed. In this connection, the Administration had been providing assistance to the industry through the Recycling Fund ("the Fund") (for example, helping the recyclers to procure
machinery). As the industry was in the process of transformation and under the influence of many factors, no specific targets for increasing the volume of recyclables could be formulated at this stage. Nonetheless, as a short-term target, the Administration would work to maintain the recycling rates. In addition, under the CGS initiative, a base would be established in each district where publicity and education activities could be organized to promote recycling.

98. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that according to the statistics presented in the Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong report, the total volume of waste tyres per annum had shown a significant increasing trend, yet the recycling rate was only about 32%. He also said that he had received complaints about lawbreakers dumping waste tyres illegally at refuse collection points in rural areas during night time. Regarding the aforesaid problem, Mr CHU requested the Administration to elaborate its plan to step up the recycling of waste tyres.

99. USEN said that at present, about 30% of waste tyres would be transported to the plants of EcoPark tenants for recycling, while the remainder would mostly be dumped in landfills. The Environment Bureau ("ENB") was now studying, in collaboration with HyD, the conversion of waste tyres into asphalt for paving, so as to explore new ways to reuse recovered waste tyres.

100. Mr AU Nok-hin said that the recycling rate of the glass bottle recycling programme implemented by the Southern DC was much higher than that of the programmes implemented by the Administration. He called on the Administration to use it as a target for increasing the amount of recovered glass bottles and to identify a suitable site for the development of CGS in the Southern District. USEN took note of the views expressed by Mr AU.

101. At the request of Mr AU Nok-hin, USEN said that the Administration would provide supplementary information after the meeting to elaborate on the current implementation of CGS, including the latest targets for the quantities of recovered waste, as well as the actual figures.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC213/17-18(01) on 3 April 2018.]

Occupational safety and health of the recycling industry

102. Mr POON Siu-ping asked whether the proposed post would work to
enhance occupational safety and health ("OSH") of projects supported by the Fund, with a view to minimizing the relevant occupational injury cases.

103. Deputy Director of Environmental Protection(2) advised that the Fund would launch programmes in collaboration with the Occupational Safety and Health Council to promote OSH of the recycling industry and provide assistance to the recyclers in taking out labour insurance. In addition, various initiatives to promote OSH would be implemented by the Industry Support Programme under the Fund. The proposed post would continue to keep in view the OSH issue and actively conduct communication with all stakeholders.

Municipal solid waste charging

104. Mr CHAN Hak-kan considered that when mapping out the legislation relating to the municipal solid waste ("MSW") charging, the Administration should adopt a principle of encouraging and not penalizing members of the public. Mr POON Siu-ping referred to the Municipal Solid Waste Reduction Office ("MSWRO") to be established by ENB to tie in with the MSW charging to be implemented by legislation. Mr POON and Mr CHAN were concerned about the coordination and cooperation between MSWRO and WRD under the leadership of the proposed post.

105. USEN advised that as waste reduction was an important environmental protection policy, the Government proposed to establish MSWRO in order to provide dedicated staffing support for promoting waste reduction initiatives in all levels of society. Upon the establishment of MSWRO, the Administration would review the existing organizational structure and revisit its division of labour with WRD under the leadership of the proposed post. The proposed post would work on the promotion of policies relating to recycling and would not be responsible for work relating to the MSW charging.

106. The meeting ended at 6:58 pm.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>易志明</td>
<td>Frankie YICK</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>胡志偉</td>
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<td>陳恒源</td>
<td>CHAN Han-pan</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>梁繼昌</td>
<td>LEUNG Che-cheung</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>梁繼昌</td>
<td>Kenneth LEUNG</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>姚敏</td>
<td>Alice MAK</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>郭家麒</td>
<td>Dr KWOK Ka-ki</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>郭國強</td>
<td>KWOK Wai-keung</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>張家輝</td>
<td>Dennis KWOK</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
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廖長江 Martin LIAO 贊成 YES
潘兆平 POON Siu-ping 贊成 YES
蔣麗芸 Ir Dr LO Sai-ying 贊成 YES
鍾國政 CHUNG Kwok-pan 贊成 YES
楊志彬 Alvin YEUNG 反對 NO
尹兆堅 Andrew WAN 反對 NO
朱凱恆 CHU Ho-dick 反對 NO
吳永嘉 Jimmy NG 反對 NO
何君堯 Dr Junius HO 贊成 YES
何毅明 HO Kai-ming 贊成 YES
林卓廷 LAM Cheuk-ting 贊成 YES
周浩鴻 Holden CHOW 贊成 YES
邵家輝 SHIU Ka-fai 贊成 YES
邵家輝 SHIU Ka-chun 贊成 YES
柯創盛 Wilson OR 贊成 YES
容海恩 YUNG Ho-yin 贊成 YES
陳浩然 Dr Pierre CHAN 反對 NO
陳雅儀 CHAN Chun-ying 贊成 YES
陳淑莊 Tanya CHAN 反對 NO
張嘉敏 CHEUNG Kwok-kwan 贊成 YES
許智豪 HUI Chi-fung 反對 NO
陸家雄 LUK Chung-hung 贊成 YES
黃浩華 LAU Kow-fan 反對 NO
郭榮鏗 Dennis Kwok 反對 NO
鄭錦森 Dr CHENG Chung-tai 反對 NO
鄭俊生 KWONG Chin-yu 反對 NO
譚文豪 Jeremy TAM 反對 NO
范國威 Gary FAN 反對 NO
區進軒 AU Nok-hin 反對 NO
鄭錦華 Vincent CHENG 贊成 YES
謝偉鈞 Tony TSE 贊成 YES
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秘書 CLERK