

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)947/17-18

(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/SE

Panel on Security

Minutes of meeting

**held on Tuesday, 9 January 2018, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present

: Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon CHU Hoi-dick

Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan
Hon CHAN Chun-ying
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai

Members attending : Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

Member absent : Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP

Public Officers attending : Item IV

Mr Sonny AU Chi-kwong, PDSM, PMSM, JP
Under Secretary for Security

Mr Vic YAU Cheuk-hang, JP
Deputy Secretary for Security 2

Mr Alex CHAN Yuen-tak
Principal Assistant Secretary for Security B

Mr Terrance TSANG Wing-hung
Assistant Director (Fire Safety)
Fire Services Department

Mr Ken NG Kin-shing
Assistant Director / Mandatory Building Inspection
Buildings Department

Mr Daniel HO Chi-wai
Director, Building Rehabilitation
Urban Renewal Authority

Item V

Mr John LEE Ka-chiu, SBS, PDSM, PMSM, JP
Secretary for Security

Mr Vic YAU Cheuk-hang, JP
Deputy Secretary for Security 2

Mr Frank KWOK Yam-yung
Exercise Director

Ms Amy YEUNG Wai-sum
Deputy Exercise Director 1

Mr MA Wai-man
Deputy Exercise Director 2

Mr Sunny WONG Sze-lut
Assistant Exercise Director 1

Mr Thomas KWOK Wang-mo
Assistant Exercise Director 3

Item VI

Mr Sonny AU Chi-kwong, PDSM, PMSM, JP
Under Secretary for Security

Mr LIU Chun-san, JP
Under Secretary for Development

Mr Wallace LAU, JP
Deputy Secretary for Transport & Housing
(Transport) 4

Ms Iris LEE
Principal Assistant Secretary for Security A

Ms Joyce CHAN
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport & Housing
(Transport) 9

Mr Timothy LUI
Assistant Secretary for Development
(Planning) 1

Captain West WU, MBS, GDSM, AE
Chief Pilot (Operations)
Government Flying Service

Captain Victor LAU
Senior Pilot (Operations) 1
Government Flying Service

Ms Ginger KIANG
Deputy Head of the Sustainable Lantau Office
(Planning & Conservation)
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Ms Joyce LAU
Chief Engineer / Lantau 3
Civil Engineering and Development Department

Miss Clara WONG
Chief Safety Officer (Airport & Safety Regulation)
Civil Aviation Department

Clerk in attendance : Miss Betty MA
Chief Council Secretary (2) 1

Staff in attendance : Mr Timothy TSO
Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1

Mr Raymond LAM
Senior Council Secretary (2) 7

Ms Kiwi NG
Legislative Assistant (2) 1

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes of previous meeting
(LC Paper No. CB(2)647/17-18)

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2017 were confirmed.

II. Information papers issued since the last meeting
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)490/17-18(01), CB(2)514/17-18(01), CB(2)579/17-18(01), CB(2)601/17-18(01), CB(2)623/17-18(01) and CB(2)653/17-18(01))

2. Members noted that the following papers had been issued since the last meeting:

- (a) letters dated 6, 8 and 28 December 2017 respectively from Ms Claudia MO;
- (b) referral from meeting between Legislative Council Members and Eastern District Council members on 14 July 2017;
- (c) Administration's response to issues raised in a letter dated 12 October 2017 from Ms Claudia MO; and
- (d) Administration's response to issues raised in a joint letter dated 31 October 2017 from Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Dr Elizabeth QUAT and Dr CHIANG Lai-wan.

III. Date of next meeting and items for discussion
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)649/17-18(01) and (02))

Special meeting on 23 January 2018

3. The Chairman reminded members that a special meeting would be held on 23 January 2018 from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm to receive a briefing by the Commissioner of Police on the crime situation in 2017.

Regular meeting in February 2018

4. Members agreed that the following items would be discussed at the next regular meeting on 6 February 2018 at 2:30 pm:

Action

- (a) New arrangements on the reciprocal notification mechanism between the Mainland and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region;
- (b) Customs enforcement against smuggling using air postal packet and express cargo; and
- (c) Proposed amendments to the First Schedule to the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance and Schedule 2 to the Control of Chemicals Ordinance.

Visits to law enforcement agencies

5. Members noted that the Administration had proposed the following visits of the Panel to facilitate members' understanding of the operations of law enforcement agencies ("LEAs"):

- (a) visit to a penal institution;
- (b) visit to better understand the enforcement work of the Customs and Excise Department against smuggling using air postal packet and shipping cargo;
- (c) visit to Junior Police Call Permanent Activity Centre cum Integrated Youth Training Camp; and
- (d) visit to Hei Ling Chau Addiction Treatment Centre.

Members agreed that the Chairman would liaise with the Administration on the visit arrangements and timing for conducting the visits.

IV. Fire Safety Improvement Works Subsidy Scheme
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)631/17-18(01) and CB(2)649/17-18(03))

6. The Chairman drew Members' attention to Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure concerning the requirement of disclosing personal pecuniary interest.

7. Under Secretary for Security ("US for S") briefed Members on the Administration's plan to devote \$2 billion to launch the Fire Safety Improvement Works Subsidy Scheme ("FSW Scheme") to subsidize owners of old composite buildings to undertake fire safety enhancement

Action

measures as required by the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance ("FS(B)O") (Cap. 572).

8. Members noted a background brief entitled "Implementation of the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance" prepared by the Legislative Council ("LegCo") Secretariat.

Whether there was a need for the Fire Safety Improvement Works Subsidy Scheme

9. The Deputy Chairman said that when FS(B)O was enacted, the financial burden arising from fire safety improvement works required was not a concern. According to his own experience in district work, the major difficulties encountered in carrying out fire safety improvement works were mainly technical but not financial in nature. He queried the need for establishing the FSW Scheme.

10. Ms Starry LEE said that she had been following up the subject of fire safety improvement works for a long time and could not agree with the views of the Deputy Chairman. While failure to comply with Fire Safety Directions ("Directions") issued by the Fire Services Department ("FSD") or the Buildings Department ("BD") might be due to various reasons, including technical problems and difficulties in forming owners' corporation ("OC") or owners' committee, owners lacking in funding was certainly a problem especially for buildings where a majority of owners were seniors facing financial difficulties. As a ceiling would be imposed under the FSW Scheme on the rateable value of residential units, the question of subsidizing owners of luxurious residential buildings or the middle class should not arise.

11. US for S said that compliance with Directions had been unsatisfactory. He stressed that certain criteria had to be met for a building to be eligible for subsidy under the FSW Scheme. For example, a ceiling on the average rateable value of residential units of a building would be imposed so that the subsidy could target those building owners with greater need for financial support.

Technical difficulties encountered by owners of buildings

12. While expressing support for the proposed FSW Scheme, Mr LAU Kwok-fan said that besides financial difficulties, many owners of old buildings were facing technical difficulties in complying with Directions.

Action

13. Assistant Director (Fire Safety), Fire Services Department ("AD(FS)/FSD") responded that in the light of the experience from implementing FS(B)O, FSD was aware that the owners of some old buildings might not be able to fully comply with the requirements specified in the Directions due to structural or spatial constraints of their buildings. To address such a problem, FSD had worked proactively with other government departments for a series of flexible and pragmatic measures. For example, FSD had lowered the capacity requirement of fire service water tanks of hose-reel systems from 2 000 litres to 500 litres for most of the composite buildings of four to six storeys, provided that relevant conditions were met. Since the introduction of these flexible and pragmatic measures, FSD had received applications from over 1 000 old buildings for adopting the measures. It was expected that these measures could help owners of old buildings on the technical front.

14. Ms Starry LEE said that FSD should follow the practice of BD and carry out fire safety improvement works for aged owners who had difficulties in complying with Directions.

15. Mr Holden CHOW said that FSD should propose and carry out the improvement works for owners of buildings who could not comply with Directions due to structural or spatial constraints.

16. Mr Alvin YEUNG asked whether FSD could carry out the fire safety improvement works required under Directions and recover the costs from owners of the buildings concerned.

17. AD(FS)/FSD responded that fire safety improvement works required under FS(B)O involved the provision of new installations and equipment, often in the common areas of old buildings, giving rise to different feasible options and works arrangements which necessitated co-ordination amongst owners. Such works were thus different in nature from building repair works carried out by BD for individual owners pursuant to the Buildings Ordinance (Cap. 123). US for S added that it would be difficult for FSD to carry out the works concerned for owners of buildings, as there were various matters requiring the agreement and coordination amongst the owners, for instance the location for installation of a fire service water tank in a building, the arrangement of annual inspection of the fire service installations and equipment, as well as the sharing of the subsequent repair and maintenance costs. US for S said that the FSW Scheme would be reviewed some time after its implementation.

Action

Eligibility for subsidy and scope of eligible buildings

18. Mr CHAN Chun-ying expressed concern that although 6 400 target composite buildings ("TCBs") had been issued Directions, the \$2 billion fund for the FSW Scheme would only benefit around 2 000 target buildings. He sought information on the criteria for assessing applications under the FSW Scheme and asked whether such criteria would be made public.

19. AD(FS)/FSD responded that factors such as the age of a building and the time elapsed after a Direction was issued would be taken into consideration in the assessment of applications. The relevant government departments would draw up the criteria, which would be made public, for assessment of applications under the FSW Scheme.

20. Mr Holden CHOW said that the Administration should at least assist owners of buildings who could not comply with Directions because of financial difficulties. Noting that there were about 6 400 TCBs and the \$2 billion fund for the FSW Scheme would benefit around 2 000 TCBs, he asked how the Administration would assist the remaining 4 400 TCBs.

21. US for S responded that about 50% of the TCBs were estimated to have formed OCs or owners' committees. Coupled with a ceiling on the average rateable value of residential units, it was estimated that around 2 000 of these TCBs would be eligible for the subsidy under the FSW Scheme. For the remaining TCBs, the Administration would continue to encourage building owners to carry out the fire safety improvement works. The Administration would review the FSW Scheme in the future.

22. Mr Alvin YEUNG asked whether FSD could provide direct subsidy to individual owners, given that buildings without OCs and owners' committees would not be eligible for subsidy under the FSW Scheme. US for S said that the Administration would launch the FSW Scheme to subsidize the costs of fire safety improvement works for buildings which had formed OCs or owners' committees. He added that different schemes had been launched by the Home Affairs Department to assist owners to form OCs as required in the Directions.

Action

23. Mr LAU Kwok-fan asked whether improvement works under the FSW Scheme and Operation Building Bright 2.0 ("OBB 2.0") could be carried out together. Director, Building Rehabilitation, Urban Renewal Authority ("D(BR)/URA") responded that a centralized application process would be developed by the Urban Renewal Authority ("URA") for the FSW Scheme and OBB 2.0. To facilitate owners in carrying out improvement works in one go, priority would be given to buildings which also applied for OBB 2.0.

24. Mr POON Siu-ping asked whether subsidy under the FSW Scheme would cover the costs of improvement works relating to the structural safety of the buildings. US for S responded that improvement works subsidized under the FSW Scheme had to be related to fire safety as required in the Directions.

25. Dr CHENG Chung-tai asked whether subsidy would be provided under different financial assistance schemes for an improvement works item. D(BR)/URA responded that double subsidy for an improvement works item would not be allowed.

26. Noting that 131 and 142 TCBs had already complied with Directions issued by BD and FSD respectively, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting said that subsidy should also be provided under the FSW Scheme to the owners of these buildings. Otherwise, owners of TCBs would be reluctant to carry out improvement works in future unless subsidies were provided by the Administration. His view was shared by the Deputy Chairman.

27. US for S responded that only buildings on which Directions had been served and with required works not yet completed prior to the date of delivery of the Chief Executive's 2017 Policy Address would be eligible for subsidy under the FSW Scheme. As FS(B)O had commenced operation since 2007, some fire safety improvement works arising from Directions previously issued might have been completed many years ago and there might have been subsequent changes in the ownership of the units concerned.

28. Dr CHENG Chung-tai expressed concern that although around 6 400 TCBs had been issued with Directions, only 32 TCBs had complied with all Directions issued by both BD and FSD. Referring to paragraph 3 of Annex I to the Administration's paper, he expressed concern about how the proposed subsidy ceiling of \$470,000 for a six-storey TCB was computed. He asked whether there would be any difference in the

Action

handling of applications from buildings which had obtained quotations for fire safety improvement works and buildings which had not obtained such quotations.

29. D(BR)/URA responded that the subsidy ceiling for each category of buildings would be determined subject to further deliberation with FSD and BD, which would be announced in due course. For eligible buildings which had not engaged any contractor for the works before applying for subsidy under the FSW Scheme, the OCs or owners' committees concerned would have to make use of the "Smart Tender" services of URA to invite tenders so as to enhance the transparency of the tendering process. As regards buildings with contractors already engaged for the fire safety improvement works before applying for the subsidy, URA's independent consultant would assess relevant documents provided by the applicants to determine the level of subsidy. In any case, each building would receive a subsidy not exceeding 60% of the costs of the required fire safety improvement works and consultancy fees, or the corresponding cap applicable to that category of buildings, whichever was the less.

Inspection of buildings and prosecution against non-compliance

30. Referring to paragraph 3 of the Administration's paper, Mr CHAN Chun-ying expressed concern that FSD and BD had only inspected around 8 500 out of 10 500 TCBs. He expressed concern about whether there was sufficient manpower for inspection of TCBs. AD(FS)/FSD responded that the inspection of TCBs were carried out by phases and an average of about 400 TCBs were inspected in a year after taking into consideration a host of factors, such as the availability of technical personnel in the market and the departmental resources.

31. Ms Starry LEE said that as the owners of TCBs were mostly seniors having practical difficulties in complying with Directions, the decision to institute prosecution against owners of old composite buildings should not be taken lightly.

32. AD(FS)/FSD responded that the enforcement authorities had been adopting a lenient approach in instigating any prosecution against owners as long as reasonable efforts had been made to comply with the requirements specified in the Directions. In the past 10 years, prosecution had only been instituted in relation to about 100 TCBs out of 6 400 TCBs with Directions issued.

Action

Pilot scheme on the use of existing fresh water supply system and rooftop fresh water tank for firefighting purpose

33. Mr POON Siu-ping expressed support for the FSW Scheme. Referring to paragraph 7 of the Administration's paper, he asked when the pilot scheme on the use of existing fresh water supply system and rooftop fresh water tank for firefighting purpose would be launched. Mr POON also asked how buildings would be selected for participation in the pilot scheme.

34. AD(FS)/FSD responded that as some owners of TCBs had encountered difficulties in installing fire service water tanks because of structural and spatial constraints, FSD and the Water Services Department ("WSD") had agreed in principle for using the existing fresh water supply system and fresh water tank for firefighting purpose in these buildings. To ensure that such an arrangement was technically feasible and would not lead to contamination of fresh water supply, a pilot scheme would be launched shortly and around 10 TCBs had been identified as target buildings for the pilot scheme. Upon completion of the pilot scheme, FSD would consider extending the measure to all suitable TCBs after evaluating on the effectiveness of the scheme.

35. The Chairman concluded that members in general supported in principle the Administration's financial proposal.

V. Exercise on the Daya Bay Contingency Plan
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)649/17-18(04) and (05))

36. Secretary for Security ("S for S") briefed Members on the results of the 2017 Exercise on the Daya Bay Contingency Plan ("DBCP"), which was codenamed CHECKERBOARD II ("the Exercise"). With the aid of powerpoint presentation, Exercise Director elaborated on the contents and results of the Exercise.

37. Members noted a background brief entitled "Daya Bay Contingency Plan" prepared by the LegCo Secretariat.

38. The Chairman said that the Administration had invited members of the Panel to observe the Exercise on 20 and 21 December 2017 and two members had joined as observers of the Exercise.

Action

Publicity and education relating to the Daya Bay Contingency Plan

39. Mr CHAN Chun-ying said that the conducting of exercises and public education would facilitate the effective operation of DBCP. He asked whether the Administration would strengthen public education on DBCP, such as through distributing publicity materials on DBCP for dissemination at primary and secondary schools. He also asked whether the Administration would establish a dedicated website for dissemination of comprehensive information on DBCP.

40. Mr Alvin YEUNG said that the Administration should educate the public on what they should do in the event of a nuclear accident near Hong Kong. There should be a dedicated webpage for dissemination of relevant information and educating the general public on how to react when there was a nuclear accident near Hong Kong.

41. The Chairman asked whether a quick reference guide would be produced on what a person should do in the event of a nuclear accident near Hong Kong.

42. S for S responded that information on the details of DBCP had been uploaded onto the website of the Security Bureau ("SB"). The Hong Kong Observatory had also established a webpage on its website to educate the public on radiation monitoring, assessment and protection. He pointed out that recent publicity efforts on DBCP had attracted the attention of the general public on DBCP, with over 5 000 views recorded for a video of the Exercise uploaded on the Facebook page of the Information Services Department. The Administration would continue to educate the public through appropriate channels on what to do in the event of a nuclear accident near Hong Kong. To promote public awareness of DBCP, SB had collaborated with the City University of Hong Kong and CLP Power Hong Kong Limited to provide information on DBCP in the university's CLP Power Low Carbon Energy Education Centre. The Administration would sustain relevant public education effort, such as organizing school talks and mini-drills, to enhance public awareness of the Administration's nuclear emergency responses.

Operational details of the Daya Bay Contingency Plan

43. Mr Holden CHOW said that the conducting of exercises would enhance the capability of the Administration in handling nuclear accidents. Referring to paragraph 5 of the Administration's paper, he

Action

asked how rumours of radiation hotspots were dealt with. He also expressed concern about the medical treatment for contaminated persons. Deputy Exercise Director 2 ("DED2") responded that such a scenario had been simulated in the Exercise. Upon knowledge of a rumour on radiation hotspot, a Radiological Survey Vehicle was deployed by the Hong Kong Observatory to carry out surveillance check on the environmental radiation levels around the suspected hotspot location. FSD's Hazardous Material Team was also deployed to search for the radioactive source. The release of radiation monitoring results to the public was also simulated.

44. Dr CHENG Chung-tai asked whether luxurious residential units with large windows had a higher risk of being exposed to radiation in the event of a nuclear accident near Hong Kong. DED2 responded that during the early phase of a nuclear accident the threat of radiation exposure would mainly come from inhalation of radioactive particles in the air, closing windows and doors would effectively block out radioactive particles.

45. Dr CHENG Chung-tai asked whether the radiation level of water from Dongjiang was monitored when there was a nuclear accident near Hong Kong. S for S responded that the radioactivity of raw water supply from Dongjiang was monitored by WSD through its monitoring stations in different parts of Hong Kong. A simulated model of a nuclear accident near Hong Kong indicated that water from Dongjiang, if contaminated, would be much diluted when arriving Hong Kong and the radiation level would be very low.

46. The Chairman asked whether radiation protective supplies would be provided to members of the public. S for S responded that most radiation protective supplies also required relevant knowledge or training before use. Unnecessary deployment of radiation protective supplies might lead to panic among members of the public.

47. Mr MA Fung-kwok said that besides Daya Bay Nuclear Power Station ("DBNPS"), there were other nuclear power stations, including the Yangjiang Nuclear Power Station, the Taishan Nuclear Power Station and Lufeng Nuclear Power Station, which had been or were being developed in Guangdong Province. He asked whether nuclear accidents at such nuclear power stations were covered by DBCP.

Action

48. S for S responded that DBCP, which included the monitoring of radiation level and the taking of relevant counter-measures, was applicable to any nuclear accident that might affect Hong Kong. The nuclear incidents and accidents of all nuclear power stations in Guangdong Province were covered by a notification mechanism agreed with the Guangdong Province. He said that DBNPS, which was located about 50 km from Hong Kong, had a very good safety record. The Taishan Nuclear Power Station was located about 130 km from Hong Kong and still under construction. The Yangjiang Nuclear Power Station was located about 220 km from Hong Kong. These two power stations were located at a relatively long distance from Hong Kong and thus the impact of nuclear accidents at these nuclear power stations would be relatively small. He added that the People's Republic of China was a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency as well as signatories to different international agreements on nuclear safety and standards.

Comments and observations of the Institut de Radioprotection et de Sûreté Nucléaire

49. Noting from paragraph 12 of the Administration's paper that Institut de Radioprotection et de Sûreté Nucléaire ("IRSN") would provide its full comments and observations on the Exercise to the Administration, the Deputy Chairman asked about the timing for provision of such information by IRSN. He said that such information should be made public.

50. S for S noted the views of the Deputy Chairman and stated that he could not comment before he had seen the report. He said that it might take a few months for IRSN to finish compiling the information.

VI. Government Flying Service Kai Tak Division
(LC Paper No. CB(2)617/17-18(01))

51. The Chairman drew Members' attention to Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure concerning the requirement of disclosing personal pecuniary interest.

[To allow sufficient time for discussion, the Chairman proposed and members agreed that the meeting would be extended to 5:00 pm.]

Action

52. US for S and Under Secretary for Development ("USDEV") briefed Members on the Administration's proposal to establish a Government Flying Service ("GFS") Kai Tak Division ("KTD"). With the aid of powerpoint presentation, Chief Engineer/Lantau 3, Civil Engineering and Development Department elaborated on the proposed project.

Cross-boundary heliport

53. Mr HO Kai-ming said that he supported the work of GFS and the establishment of GFS KTD. However, he opposed to the establishment of a co-located cross-boundary heliport at the proposed site. The noise generated by commercial helicopters might cause nuisance to residents along the coastline of Kowloon East, such as residents of Laguna City. Given that the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge and the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link would come into operation in the near future, he expressed doubt about the need for a commercial cross-boundary heliport at the proposed site.

54. Deputy Secretary for Transport & Housing (Transport) 4 ("DST4") responded that the establishment of a cross-boundary heliport was one of the initiatives in the Financial Secretary's 2017-2018 Budget Speech. The initiative was in line with the policy directive to promote development of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay Area.

55. Mr Jeremy TAM expressed support for the Administration's proposal. He said that with developments under the Tung Chung New Town Extension ("TCNTE") coming up along the northern shore of Lantau, it was necessary to establish GFS KTD. The establishment of a commercial cross-boundary heliport, which was one of the initiatives under the development of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Bay Area, would promote the aviation development of Hong Kong. He pointed out that the site had already been zoned as "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Heliport" many years ago.

56. Mr Frankie YICK expressed support for the establishment of GFS KTD and a co-located commercial cross-boundary heliport. He said that the concerns of residents along the coastline of Kowloon East about possible noise nuisance could be addressed by the planning of helicopter flight paths. He sought information on the level of fee to be levied on commercial helicopters for use of the cross-boundary heliport. DS(T)4 responded that the level of fee to be levied would be determined at a later stage.

Action

57. Mr MA Fung-kwok expressed support for the establishment of a GFS Division in urban areas and a co-located commercial cross-boundary heliport. He said that noise nuisance generated from the proposed cross-boundary heliport would certainly be much less than that generated from the former Kai Tak Airport which was located at the same site. He expressed concern about whether the proposed project, which would involve the construction of a take-off/landing pad for one helicopter and two helicopter parking pads, could be expanded to provide more parking pads for GFS helicopters and an enlarged helicopter take-off/landing pad. He asked whether GFS helicopters in emergency service would be given priority in using the take-off/landing pad.

58. Mr Holden CHOW expressed support for the Administration's proposal and a co-located commercial cross-boundary heliport. He noted that with the developments under TCNTE coming up along the northern shore of Lantau Island, the North Lantau Expressway flight route would be hampered by the buildings below the flight path and thus there was a need for GFS to establish an operational base outside its Headquarters. He expressed concern about whether priority would be given to GFS helicopters in emergency service in the use of the take-off/landing pad at the proposed site.

59. Chief Pilot (Operations), Government Flying Service ("CP(O)/GFS") responded that, similar to the arrangement adopted at GFS Wan Chai Heliport near the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre, GFS' emergency services would be given priority in using the take-off/landing pad in the proposed GFS KTD.

60. Mr KWOK Wai-keung expressed support for the establishment of GFS KTD at the proposed site. He expressed concern about whether the proposed site was suitable for establishing a commercial cross-boundary heliport, given that it was unlikely for visitors arriving by cruise ships to use cross-boundary helicopter service. If the cross-boundary heliport could be relocated elsewhere, more space might be opened to public for enjoyment.

61. USDEV responded that the suitability of the proposed site for establishing a commercial cross-boundary heliport had been fully considered in the past when the Kai Tak Development in the context of the Outline Zoning Plan was discussed. The proposed site had been identified as the only site in the urban area suitable for the said purpose.

Action

On the other hand, the landscaped garden proposed at the rooftop of Cruise Terminal and the adjacent Runway Park would continue to provide public open space for the community to enjoy.

62. The Chairman said that Mr KWOK Wai-keung and Mr Kenneth LEUNG had respectively indicated intention to move a motion on the subject. He ruled that the motions were directly related to the agenda item in accordance with Rule 22(p) of the House Rules and said that the motions would be dealt with in the latter part of the meeting.

Facilities and operation of the Government Flying Service Kai Tak Division

63. Mr Kenneth LEUNG asked how the size of the air command and control centre at GFS KTD compared with that at the GFS Headquarters and whether fixed-wing aircraft would be deployed at GFS KTD.

64. CP(O)/GFS responded that as there was no runway at the proposed site, fixed-wing aircraft would not be deployed at GFS KTD. As GFS KTD would mainly be involved in the provision of emergency services by helicopters, the size of its air command and control centre would be about 10% to 20% of that at the GFS Headquarters.

65. Mr POON Siu-ping expressed support for the Administration's proposal to establish GFS KTD. Noting that the hangar for GFS KTD would accommodate two helicopters, he asked whether two additional helicopters would be procured by GFS. CP(O)/GFS responded that GFS was procuring seven new helicopters to replace the existing fleet. Two of the new helicopters would be stationed at GFS KTD upon its commissioning. GFS would keep two of the seven helicopters in the existing fleet at GFS Headquarters for contingency use and support purpose.

66. Mr YIU Si-wing expressed support for the establishment of GFS KTD and a co-located commercial cross-boundary heliport. He asked whether the Administration had projected the number of take-offs and landings at the proposed cross-boundary heliport and assessed the impact on residents in Kowloon East. He also asked whether the construction of immigration and customs facilities of the proposed cross-boundary heliport had been included in the proposed project.

Action

67. DS(T)4 responded that the Administration would commission a consultancy study on the demand for commercial cross-boundary helicopter service in the first quarter of 2018. He said that about 26 000 square feet of space at the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal building, which was currently used by another government department on a temporary basis, had been reserved for use as immigration and customs clearance area for the cross-boundary heliport and the relevant costs had not been included in the proposed project.

68. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed support for the Administration's proposal and commended GFS for its rescue work. He said that as the Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA") was very busy, there was a need for GFS to establish an operational base outside its Headquarters at HKIA and the proposed site, located on the tip of the Ex-Kai Tak Runway, was the most suitable one. He considered that there was a need for commercial cross-boundary helicopter service and the proposed site was most suitable given that it was adjacent to the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal.

69. Dr Elizabeth QUAT expressed support for the Administration's proposal, as well as the co-located commercial cross-boundary heliport. She said that the proposed site would facilitate GFS's rescue operations in urban areas. She expressed concern about a high turnover rate of GFS pilots and asked about the measures adopted by GFS to attract new recruits and retain staff. CP(O)/GFS responded that GFS was fully aware of the attraction from the commercial aviation sector and had expedited the recruitment of various departmental grades, especially pilots and aircrew members, to fill vacancies as soon as possible and strengthened training to meet its operational needs. He stressed that while its staff were committed to serving the community, GFS would endeavor to enhance training with a view to providing young aircrew with a wider perspective on GFS' missions and duties, as well as a sense of recognition on GFS' unique job nature. GFS will continue to discuss and work with the relevant stakeholders for measures to address the pilots wastage problem. US for S added that the Administration had commissioned the Efficiency Unit to conduct a management study on GFS and the Efficiency Unit had provided advice on areas such as manpower deployment, workflow, automation and administrative support.

Action

Manpower support and training

70. Mr Jeremy TAM said that sufficient manpower and training should be provided to support the operation of GFS KTD. Mr Kenneth LEUNG asked whether the manpower for GFS KTD would be recruited or redeployed from the GFS Headquarters at Chek Lap Kok.

71. Mr POON Siu-ping expressed concern about whether GFS could recruit adequate staff for GFS KTD, given that it was difficult for GFS to recruit and retain pilots.

72. CP(O)/GFS responded that according to the current plan, subject to resources to be made available to GFS, it would recruit suitable number of additional aircrew members as well as other supporting staff and provide the required training to them to meet the operational needs of GFS KTD. US for S added that a total of 63 posts had been added to the manpower establishment of GFS in 2016-2017 and 2017-2018.

[The Chairman proposed and members agreed that the meeting would be further extended to 5:10 pm.]

Motions proposed respectively by members

73. Mr KWOK Wai-keung moved the following motion:

"本事務委員會認同政府飛行服務隊在啟德跑道末端分部的需要，但要求政府擱置直升機場兼作跨境商業用途的決定，減少直升機升降及其噪音對東九沿岸居民的影響；同時本會亦要求改善項目設計，加強啟德分部與社區連結，並增加項目開放予公眾的空間，令公共服務能高效維持之餘，亦令市民可享有啟德跑道末端的景觀及作公共空間。"

(Translation)

"While acknowledging the need for GFS to establish a division at the tip of the Kai Tak Runway, this Panel requests the Government to shelve its decision to also use the site for establishing a cross-boundary heliport for commercial uses, thus reducing the impact of helicopter movements and hence the noise impact on residents along the coastline of Kowloon East; this Panel also requests the Government to improve the project design so as to

Action

enhance the linkage between the GFS KTD and adjacent communities, and to provide more space which is made open to the public under the project, so that efficient public service can be maintained while the public can enjoy the vista over the tip of the Kai Tak Runway and use the public open space."

74. Mr Jeremy TAM said that although he was not a member of the Panel and thus had no voting right at the meeting, he opposed to Mr KWOK Wai-keung's motion.

75. The Chairman put Mr KWOK Wai-keung's motion to vote. Mr KWOK requested a division.

The following members voted in favour of the motion:

Ms Alice MAK and Mr KWOK Wai-keung.
(two members)

The following members voted against the motion:

Ms Starry LEE, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan, Mr CHAN Chun-ying, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr LAU Kwok-fan and Dr CHENG Chung-tai.
(17 members)

The following member abstained from voting:

Dr Junius HO
(one member)

76. The Chairman declared that two members voted for and 17 members voted against the motion and one member abstained. He declared that the motion moved by Mr KWOK Wai-keung was negatived.

77. Mr Kenneth LEUNG moved the following motion:

"本委員會促請政府提供足夠人力資源配套，以配合飛行服務隊啟德分部的建立。"

Action

(Translation)

"This Panel urges the Government to make sufficient human resource provisions to support the establishment of GFS KTD."

78. The Chairman put Mr Kenneth LEUNG's motion to vote. 17 members voted in favour of the motion and no member voted against the motion. The Chairman declared that the motion moved by Mr Kenneth LEUNG was carried.

79. The Chairman concluded that members in general supported the Administration's submission of its proposal to the Public Works Subcommittee.

80. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:05 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
27 February 2018