



ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT 建築署

QUEENSWAY GOVERNMENT OFFICES, 66 QUEENSWAY, HONG KONG. 香港金鐘道六十六號金鐘道政府合署

來函檔號 Your Ref. : CB4/PAC/R70
 本函檔號 Our Ref. : 10/1-125/33
 電話號碼 Tel. No. : 2867 3877
 傳真號碼 Fax No. : 2523 4693

By fax 2543 9197 and e-mail
 (ahychu@legco.gov.hk, kmho@legco.gov.hk & pkwlai@legco.gov.hk)

11 June 2018

Mr Anthony CHU
 Clerk to the Public Accounts Committee
 Legislative Council
 Legislative Council Complex
 1 Legislative Council Road
 Central, Hong Kong

Dear Mr CHU,

Public Accounts Committee
Consideration of Chapter 1 of the Director of Audit's Report No. 70
Management of restored landfills

Thank you for your letter dated 30 May 2018 requesting response / information to facilitate the Public Accounts Committee's consideration of the above Chapter. Please find our reply below:

- (a) with reference to Table 4 of paragraph 3.2, please explain and provide Information on:
- (i) differences in role, division of work and responsibilities between EPD, LCSD and other departments which acted as the works agents in developing the seven recreational projects;

For the Jordan Valley Park project (item 3) and Ngau Chi Wan Park project (item 7) in Table 4, the role of ArchSD was the works agent and the work involved :

- assisting user departments in developing their requirements;
- appointing consultants to carry out design and construction supervision for the facilities to meet users' requirements and Government's needs;

- appointing contractors to carry out construction of the facilities; and
- inspecting works to ensure the facilities are developed up to standard.

For the Kwai Chung Park project (item 1) in Table 4, ArchSD had provided advisory services to LCSD before confirmation of the role of works agent.

- (ii) factors and criteria when assigning which department as works agents for individual projects;

Depending on the works nature, ArchSD would usually be the works agent for LCSD's capital works projects under Head 703.

For District Minor Works (DMW) projects, please refer to HAD's response.

- (iii) relevant works agent for items 3, 4 and 7 sought funding approval from FC of LegCo after detailed design stage, which was different from projects under District Minor Works Programme (i.e. items 2, 5 and 6) in which funding was sought after feasibility study stage (Note 1 to the Table refers); the procedure and approval required for the change/increase in the project cost;

For the capital works projects for which ArchSD was works agent (items 3 and 7), the procedures and approvals required for change/increase in the project costs would follow the previous Financial Circular No. 11/2004, i.e. SFST may approve, under delegated authority from FC of LegCo, minor changes to project scope or increase in Approved Project Estimate (APE) which does not exceed \$15 million. Any increase in APE exceeding \$15 million must be submitted to FC of LegCo for approval.

- (b) is there a standing mechanism for LCSD, HAD and ArchSD to inform EPD of the progress of the development of recreational projects at restored landfills and findings of the studies and surveys conducted on the landfills by the consultants/contractors commissioned by these departments. If yes, details, including when and what information has been conveyed of EPD;

There is no standing mechanism for ArchSD to inform EPD but during implementation of projects at restored landfills, ArchSD with its consultant would closely liaise with EPD and its contractor regarding progress, design and construction issues that would affect the aftercare facilities as appropriate. ArchSD would submit those studies and surveys that are related to landfill aftercare facilities to EPD for comments.

For the Jordan Valley Park project, ArchSD had closely liaised with EPD and its contractor through letters, memoranda, e-mails, meetings and joint site visits for resolving design issues and had informed EPD about the findings/studies related

to the landfill aftercare facilities during the whole process of design development. For the Jordan Valley Park project, the Landfill Gas Hazard Assessment (LGHA) and the design details of the proposed afteruse facilities had been submitted to EPD for comments. For the Kwai Chung Park project, the preliminary LGHA would be conducted in the feasibility study stage for submission to EPD and the detailed LGHA would be completed before finalisation of detailed design.

Kwai Chung Park

- (c) according to Note 2 to Table 4, details on the technical advice given by ArchSD to LCSD on the Kwai Chung Park project, such as when the advice was given and a brief description of the advice;

ArchSD provided advice to LCSD on the technical aspects in Dec 2017 and Feb 2018, major items as follows:-

- a. Landfill Gas Hazard Assessment (LGHA) will be required to be submitted to the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) for endorsement.
 - b. In view of the site constraints, functional areas and spaces would be fragmented, and induce security and management problem in this regard.
 - c. Large areas of slopes would limit development area and increase maintenance cost.
 - d. Widespread gas monitoring wells in the site will restrict the proposed project development
 - e. LCSD to reconsider incorporating the other flatland into the site e.g. HKJC International BMX Park and Temporary Cricket Ground for better planning of use or to review the site area by confining to the flatland / gentle slope areas.
- (d) ArchSD informed HAB/LCSD in May 2014 and May 2017 that a landfill gas hazard assessment should be conducted before proceeding with the Technical Feasibility Statement to confirm the technical feasibility of the proposed project (paragraphs 3.7 and 3.10 refer), and expressed concern in May 2017 on whether the project could be launched before 2022. Please provide the following information:
- (i) reasons for ArchSD to state that HAB should arrange funding for carrying out the landfill gas hazard assessment in July 2014 when it advised that the site was not suitable for the proposed golf driving range but no proposed new use was stated in HAB's Project Definition Statement (paragraphs 3.7 refers). Is ArchSD of the view that the landfill gas hazard assessment should be conducted irrespective of whether a specific use being identified;

ArchSD considered that the Landfill Gas Hazard Assessment (LGHA) should be conducted after the proposed project scope has been determined as the assessment should take into account the specific use in the site. ArchSD advised HAB on 10 July 2014 to review the project scope by removing the golf driving range, and so, in order to ascertain the feasibility of the revised scope of work, it was necessary to conduct a LGHA. ArchSD advised HAB/LCSD to source necessary funding such that the LGHA could be carried out in good time once the project scope was confirmed.

- (ii) reasons for EPD/ ArchSD to have “no objection” for HAB/LCSD to carry out the landfill gas hazard assessment at detailed planning stage despite that the findings of the assessment might affect the completion time and cost of the project.

Landfill Gas Hazard Assessment often comprises two stages.

The first stage, or 'Preliminary Qualitative Assessment' , is carried out at the early planning stage of a development project and its scope is necessarily limited by the level of available detail about the proposed development. The aim is to determine the acceptability in principle of a proposed development and to identify the scope of any further investigations which may be required to complete the assessment.

The second stage, or 'Detailed Qualitative Risk Assessment', is undertaken at the stage when the project is definitely proceeding and when all the relevant details of its design and results of any site investigations are known. The detailed assessment will review and, where necessary, revise the findings of the initial assessment.

ArchSD had indicated to LCSD that there was no strong view on conducting LGHA at a more detailed planning stage but also advised LCSD that in case of significant changes to the scope, design and construction of the project are necessary at a more detailed design stage due to the finding of the LGHA, there would be time and cost implications which could have been dealt with or mitigated earlier with a 'Preliminary Qualitative Assessment' carried out.

Yours sincerely,



(Edward TSE)

for Director of Architectural Services

- c.c. Secretary for Environment (fax no. 2537 7278)
Secretary for Home Affairs (fax no. 2591 5536)
Director of Environment Protection (fax no. 2891 2512)
Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (fax no. 2691 4661)
Director of Home Affairs (fax no. 2574 8638)
Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (fax no. 2147 5239)
Director of Audit (fax no. 2583 9063)