

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. PWSC200/19-20  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(12)B

**Public Works Subcommittee of the Finance Committee  
of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Wednesday, 26 February 2020, at 8:30 am**

**Members present:**

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan

Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS  
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

**Member attending:**

Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

**Members absent:**

Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH, JP

**Public officers attending:**

Mr Howard LEE Man-sing	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>3</sup>
Mr LAM Sai-hung, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Ms Bernadette LINN, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Ms Maisie CHENG Mei-sze, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment

Ms Margaret HSIA Mai-chi	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr David LAM Chi-man	Principal Assistant Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)5
Mr Frankie FUNG Yiu-man	Chief Assistant Secretary for Development (Works)1
Ms Alice LEE Nga-lai	Chief Superintendent (Planning and Development) Hong Kong Police Force
Ms Judith TAM Ngai-yin	Senior Executive Officer (Planning and Development) Hong Kong Police Force
Mr Albert CHEUNG Ka-lok	Assistant Director of Lands (Specialist)3
Mrs Sylvia LAM YU Ka-wai, JP	Director of Architectural Services
Mr LEUNG Kam-pui	Assistant Director of Architectural Services (Property Services)
Mr Wilson PANG Wai-sing	Deputy Director of Drainage Services
Mr Ricky LAU Chun-kit, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr CHENG Tak-kuen	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Infrastructure Planning)
Mr Raymond WONG Wai-man	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Recycling Network Review) Environmental Protection Department
Mr NG Wai-keung	Deputy Director of Highways
Mr Tony CHEUNG Ka-leung	Deputy Project Manager (Major Works)1 Highways Department
Mr Paul AU Ying-kit	Chief Engineer (Works) (Acting) Home Affairs Department

Mr Louis LEUNG Sze-ho Deputy Secretary-General (1)  
University Grants Committee Secretariat

Mr Samuel FAN Kim-fung Chief Maintenance Surveyor (School  
Premises Maintenance)  
Education Bureau

Ms CHAN Lai-hung Senior Maintenance Surveyor (School  
Premises Maintenance)  
Education Bureau

Mr Alex WONG Kwok-chun Assistant Director of Social Welfare  
(Subventions)

Mr Andy LIU Hon-wah Chief Executive Officer (Planning)1  
Social Welfare Department

Mr WONG Chung-leung, JP Director of Water Supplies

Mr Boer CHAN Hon-kwong Assistant Government Chief Information  
Officer (Governance and Resources)  
Office of the Government Chief  
Information Officer

Mr Gavin WAH Kwok-kee Chief Systems Manager (Governance and  
Resources)  
Office of the Government Chief  
Information Officer

Mr Michael HONG Wing-kit Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works  
Programme)  
Transport and Housing Bureau

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Doris LO Chief Council Secretary (1)2

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Raymond CHOW Senior Council Secretary (1)10  
Ms Christina SHIU Legislative Assistant (1)2  
Ms Christy YAU Legislative Assistant (1)8

Action

---

The Chairman advised that there were four papers for discussion on the meeting agenda. The first to third funding proposals were carried over from the meeting on 22 January 2020 while the fourth funding proposal was a new submission from the Administration. The four funding proposals involved a total funding allocation of \$25,197.3 million. He reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the proposals. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting in case of direct pecuniary interest.

Meeting arrangement

2. Ms Tanya CHAN pointed out that in view of the coronavirus disease 2019 ("COVID-19") pandemic, both LegCo and government departments had implemented measures for disease prevention, including cancelling a number of meetings of LegCo committees and adopting special work arrangements. Under such circumstances, Ms CHAN asked the Chairman to explain why he decided that today's meeting of the Public Works Subcommittee should be held as usual, and how the health of LegCo Secretariat staff supporting the meeting could be safeguarded. Dr CHENG Chung-tai also opined that the health risks of staff and government officials attending the meeting should be given fair consideration.

3. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that the responsibility rested on the Chairman to consider the possible increase in the risk of spreading the disease by holding a meeting at this moment and its contradiction to the current objectives of disease prevention and public health efforts. Dr CHEUNG pointed out that anti-pandemic work and relief measures dominated the meeting agendas of LegCo and its committees even if meetings had recently been held. However, the major item on the agenda for the current meeting of the Subcommittee was about the Capital Works Reserve Fund block allocations ("block allocations"), which was not directly related to the above efforts and measures. He was therefore opposed to holding the Subcommittee meeting today.

4. The Chairman said that a number of meetings of the Subcommittee had recently been cancelled due to the pandemic. However, business of LegCo had not come to a complete stop while there was urgency on

consideration of the block allocations proposal and the allocations involving many projects related to public health should be approved by the Finance Committee ("FC") before 1 April this year. In view of this, he decided that the meeting should be held for examining the proposal. The Chairman also said that he had maintained close liaison with the LegCo Secretariat on the meeting arrangement for the Subcommittee and the necessary disease prevention measures, and appropriate arrangements had been made by the Secretariat. He believed that the government officials attending the meeting had also taken appropriate disease prevention measures. Mr Tony TSE agreed with the Chairman's decision to hold the meeting and said that the block allocations which involved a number of minor works were vital in keeping workers in the construction sector employed.

#### Projects of quarantine facilities

5. Referring to media reports that the Administration would spend about \$190 million on constructing quarantine facilities at a government site at Penny's Bay, Mr CHU Hoi-dick questioned why the Administration had allocated funds for implementing the project without obtaining the approval of the Subcommittee and FC.

6. The Chairman pointed out that Mr CHU had made a written enquiry on the matter (LC Paper No. FC104/19-20(01)). In this connection, the Chairman of FC had directed that the Administration should provide a written response. Although the funding proposal for the quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay was not part of the meeting agenda, the Chairman said that he would exercise discretion to allow officials who were present at the meeting to respond briefly to members' questions on the matter. Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") replied that an allocation was provided from the Lottery Fund ("LF") for the works of the quarantine camp at Penny's Bay, and a contractor was engaged to implement the project.

7. The Chairman enquired about the funding mechanism of LF and the procedure by which the contractor was engaged by the Administration for project implementation. Mr Tony TSE also requested the Administration to take the initiative to provide the details of the project of quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay.

8. Ms Tanya CHAN was dissatisfied that the Administration had awarded the project of the quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay to a contractor through direct engagement without inviting tenders, and enquired whether any other quarantine facilities had previously been built with allocations from LF. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that using the allocations from LF for building quarantine facilities ran contrary to the intention of establishing LF.

Dr CHENG Chung-tai questioned why the Administration did not use the \$30 billion Anti-epidemic Fund which was set up recently upon FC's approval for constructing the quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay.

9. DCED further explained that the Administration had to construct the related quarantine facilities as fast as possible in view of the development of the COVID-19 pandemic and the urgency of disease prevention efforts. Therefore, a contractor who had the relevant engineering experience and capabilities and the necessary machinery, equipment and manpower and proposed reasonable project costs was engaged by the Civil Engineering and Development Department pursuant to the Stores and Procurement Regulations to implement the site formation and infrastructure works at a government site at Penny's Bay and construct the first batch of about 100 temporary quarantine units using the "Modular Integrated Construction" ("MIC") method. The works concerned had commenced on 17 February this year and were expected to be completed in May for the functioning of quarantine facilities.

**Capital Works Reserve Fund Block Allocations  
PWSC(2019-20)23 — Provision for Capital Works Reserve  
Fund block allocations in 2020-21**

10. The Chairman advised that the proposal (i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)23](#)) involved a total allocation of \$22,515.5 million for the block allocation subheads under the Capital Works Reserve Fund ("CWRF") for 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. The Subcommittee had commenced deliberation on the funding submission at the meetings on 15 January and 22 January 2020. The deliberation continued at the meeting.

Arrangement for examining the block allocations proposal

11. Mr Wilson OR expressed support for the block allocations proposal. He relayed the concern of local communities about LegCo's progress in examining the block allocations proposal and enquired how the Administration would ensure that the block allocations proposal could be approved by FC early, and what contingency plans it had in place in the event that the proposal could not be approved by FC before 1 April this year. Mr Holden CHOW said that since many items under the block allocations proposal were related to people's livelihood, the Administration should submit the funding proposal to FC for consideration as soon as possible.

12. Ms Claudia MO enquired which items under the block allocations proposal could be funded by allocations from LF instead in the event that the proposal could not be approved by FC before 1 April this year.

13. Dr CHENG Chung-tai was concerned whether the Administration intended to withdraw the block allocations proposal from the meeting agenda of the Public Works Subcommittee and directly submit the proposal to FC and re-order FC's agenda items for FC to give priority to examining the proposal; if so, when the Administration would make such a decision. Dr CHENG opined that in view of a large number of items related to people's livelihood on FC's meeting agenda pending consideration, it was inappropriate to accord priority to examining the block allocations proposal.

14. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that the President of LegCo and the Chairmen of various LegCo committees had different stances towards holding meetings under the pandemic, leaving members in limbo. He therefore urged the President of LegCo and the Chairmen of various committees to work out with the Administration the criteria for deciding whether a meeting should be held based on the urgency and priority of the matters to be discussed, so that matters related to tackling the pandemic would be discussed first. Dr Fernando CHEUNG agreed that the Subcommittee should accord priority to considering items related to tackling the pandemic.

15. Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)3 ("DS(Tsy)3/FSTB") responded that if the block allocations proposal could not be approved by FC before 1 April 2020, some 10 000 on-going projects that were important albeit their small scale and some 1 000 new projects would have to be discontinued or could not commence at all, and the livelihood of many practitioners and workers in the construction sector would be affected. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a number of meetings of the Subcommittee had recently been cancelled, resulting in the loss of many hours of meeting time. Therefore, the Administration would consider different contingency plans depending on the examination progress of the block allocations proposal, including the possible need to withdraw the block allocations proposal from the Subcommittee and directly submit the proposal to FC, so that FC would have sufficient time to deliberate on the block allocations proposal with a view to approving the funding application by 1 April 2020. Under the existing mechanism, if the funding application was approved by FC, the items set out under the funding submission for the block allocations proposal would be charged to CWRF and would not be funded by LF.



Further questions on projects of quarantine facilities

16. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether the capital costs of the quarantine facilities constructed at the Junior Police Call Permanent Activity Centre in Pat Heung ("JPC@Pat Heung") and at Lei Yue Mun Park and Holiday Village ("LYMPHV") were funded by allocations from LF or by block allocations, and about the amount of the costs. Ms Tanya CHAN sought the respective details of the contractors and construction works of the above projects.

17. Director of Architectural Services ("DArchS") replied that:

- (a) the works for quarantine facilities at JPC@Pat Heung comprised two parts: (i) retrofitting of existing hostel units of JPC@Pat Heung for conversion to temporary quarantine units by Cheung Hing Construction Company Limited, a term contractor of the Government, at a project cost of around \$10 million to be funded by block allocations; and (ii) construction of new temporary quarantine units by Hip Hing Engineering Company Limited, a contractor directly engaged by the Government, at a project cost of around \$50 million (for two different works processes, namely land formation and construction works) to be funded by an allocation from LF;
- (b) LYMPHV covered an area of 23 hectares. In view of factors such as development of the pandemic, the scale of the facilities and the site area required, the temporary quarantine facilities had to be built at two different locations within LYMPHV (i.e. the basketball court at upper LYMPHV and the football pitch at lower LYMPHV) and projects had to be created for two different works processes (i.e. land formation and construction works), giving rise to four projects altogether. The total project cost would be around \$70 million and the cost of each project would be less than \$30 million and these projects would be funded by block allocations. Among them, two construction projects with respective costs of around \$19.5 million and \$29.9 million were charged to Subhead 3101GX of Head 703 — Buildings, and the other two land formation projects with respective costs of around \$5 million and \$20 million were charged to Subhead 5101CX of Head 705 — Civil Engineering. China State Construction Engineering (Hong Kong) Limited had been directly engaged by the Administration to implement the

four aforesaid projects; and

- (c) the Administration had also directly engaged Paul Y. Construction Company Limited to construct the temporary quarantine facilities at the Sai Kung Outdoor Recreation Centre, and the project cost concerned would also be funded by block allocations.

18. Regarding the project of quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay, DCED supplemented that the project included land formation and infrastructure works (such as water supply, drainage, sewerage and roads) at the government site and provision of security, healthcare, fire services and other related facilities for the provision of not less than 600 quarantine units in total. The project also included the construction of the first batch of 100 quarantine units.

19. At the request of Ms Tanya CHAN and Dr KWOK Ka-ki, the Administration undertook to provide supplementary information after the meeting on the respective construction costs of the temporary quarantine units to be constructed at the government site at Penny's Bay, JPC@Pat Heung and LYMPHV using the MIC method.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC105/19-20\(01\)](#) on 5 March 2020.)*

20. Dr Junius HO suggested that the Administration should consider constructing quarantine facilities on Hei Ling Chau to prepare for disease outbreaks that might occur incessantly in future. He opined that Hei Ling Chau, which was located far away from the urban areas, was a suitable location. If necessary, the quarantine facilities on the island could be further extended to Sunshine Island in its proximity. DArchS undertook to relay Dr HO's suggestion to the relevant government departments for follow-up.

21. Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Ms Claudia MO and Dr CHENG Chung-tai criticized the Administration for directly engaging China Harbour Engineering Company Limited, China State Construction Engineering (Hong Kong) Limited and Hip Hing Engineering Company Limited to implement the construction projects of the quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay, LYMPHV and JPC@Pat Heung respectively without inviting tenders and seeking FC's funding approval. They requested the Administration to give an account of the justifications for directly engaging the above contractors to implement the projects and the process involved.

Mr CHU and Mr KWONG questioned whether only contractors on friendly terms with the Government were directly engaged by the Administration to implement the projects. Mr KWONG also enquired whether the above contractors were the only ones in the market which had the capacity to construct quarantine facilities.

22. DArchS and DCED stressed that the Administration decided to award the contracts of constructing the temporary quarantine facilities to the contractors by way of direct engagement due to the utmost urgency of constructing such facilities. The engagement process also complied with the requirements under the Stores and Procurement Regulations. Moreover, the Administration decided to directly engage these contractors in view of their relevant engineering experience and capabilities, the machinery, equipment and manpower they had as well as the reasonable project costs they proposed. The Administration did not have information about the number of companies in the market capable of constructing quarantine facilities.

23. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Dr CHENG Chung-tai were dissatisfied that while the Subcommittee was in the process of examining the block allocations proposal, the Administration had not taken the initiative to provide the Subcommittee with supplementary information concerning the relevant adjustment after the inclusion of the projects of quarantine facilities under the block allocations proposal. Mr CHAN also criticized that even though the construction of quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay was funded by LF, the Administration was still obliged to take the initiative to inform LegCo Members. Dr Junius HO opined that the Administration should provide a clear account of the details of various projects of quarantine facilities to address members' concerns.

24. DArchS said that the Administration had provided the Subcommittee with the list of items proposed to be funded under block allocation subheads for 2020-2021 in December 2019, therefore the projects of temporary quarantine facilities that commenced recently were not included in the list. Under the block allocations mechanism, the Administration could nevertheless create items that were not originally included in the list in view of the actual needs of the community at the time, such as the current emergency pandemic situation.

25. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested the Administration to provide supplementary information on whether the projects of the temporary quarantine facilities at JPC@Pat Heung and LYMPHV had been added to the list of items proposed to be funded under block allocation subheads for 2020- 2021; if so, provide information on these projects.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC105/19-20\(01\)](#) on 5 March 2020.)*

26. Mr Alvin YEUNG and Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired about the criteria adopted by the Administration in deciding whether the implementation of projects of quarantine facilities should be funded by block allocations and/or allocations from LF. Mr YEUNG also enquired, if the pandemic persisted, whether the Administration would include other new projects of quarantine facilities under the block allocations proposal before it was considered by FC; if so, which government department could make such a decision, and whether the Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau ("FSTB") had fulfilled its goal-keeping role to ensure that the purpose of the expenditure involved in such projects was within the ambit of the payment subhead/fund. Dr CHEUNG and Dr KWOK Ka-ki were also concerned whether the allocations from LF could be used for purposes other than social welfare (e.g. construction of quarantine facilities).

27. DS(Tsy)3/FSTB responded that in deciding to implement a new project and determining the applicable funding/payment subhead to which the cost should be charged, government departments had to consider whether the purpose of the expenditure involved in the project was within the ambit of the funding/payment subhead concerned and seek funding approval in accordance with the established procedure. For items to be funded by block allocations, the controlling officer for the respective subhead had to ensure that the purpose of the expenditure involved was within the ambit of the payment subhead.

28. DArchS supplemented that as the controlling officer for subheads under Head 703, she would consider factors such as the nature, urgency and technical feasibility of a newly-created project in deciding whether it should be included in the block allocations proposal, and she would also consider the relevant requirements (e.g. whether the schedule of accommodation involved in the project had been approved by the Property Vetting Committee and whether the project cost exceeded the funding ceiling of FC). The funding proposal would be eventually examined and approved by the relevant committees, such as the Accommodation Strategy Group and the Minor Building Works Committee.

29. Regarding the uses of LF, Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Subventions) said that in determining whether an application met the ambit of LF, the controlling officer had to follow the statutory requirements under the Government Lotteries Ordinance (Cap. 334), the resolution made by the former Legislative Council in 1965 on the purposes of allocations from LF

and the 47 approved purposes of LF projects formulated by the Social Welfare Advisory Committee in 1994.

30. Mr WU Chi-wai questioned why the Administration had not established the projects of the quarantine facilities as separate proposals and sought FC's funding approval in adherence to the usual practice for public works projects. Given that an LF grant exceeding \$4 million would require the funding approval of the Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury ("SFST"), Dr KWOK Ka-ki enquired whether SFST had granted approval for the construction of quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay to be funded by an allocation from LF, and whether other officials of FSTB were informed of SFST's decision.

31. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that the Administration should comply with procedural justice when taking forward the projects of quarantine facilities. He opined that the Administration should not split the projects of quarantine facilities and then obtain the required project funding through block allocations and LF respectively to circumvent LegCo's monitoring, and requested the Administration to explain the criteria for splitting projects. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Ms Claudia Mo and Mr KWONG Chun-yu also expressed concern about the Administration's splitting the projects of quarantine facilities.

32. DS(Tsy)3/FSTB explained that government departments would seek funding in accordance with the relevant procedure with regard to project nature and actual needs. DArchS supplemented that the Administration had not split the projects of temporary quarantine facilities. In view of the volatile development of the pandemic and the urgent need of quarantine facilities, the Government should conduct a comprehensive review on various possible ways to provide such facilities as quickly as possible. For instance, the project of temporary quarantine facilities at JPC@Pat Heung would provide temporary quarantine facilities based on different nature of the works, including the retrofitting of existing hostel units within a short time for conversion to temporary quarantine facilities to be funded under CWRF and construction of additional temporary quarantine units using the MIC method. It was appropriate and proper to construct the additional temporary quarantine facilities using allocations from LF as long as it was within the ambit of LF.

33. Referring to the improvement works within the Hong Kong Police Headquarters, Wan Chai, Mr Andrew WAN commented that such works were split by the Hong Kong Police Force into multiple items in order to be included under the block allocations proposal and enquired whether it was a usual practice of government departments. Mr WAN suggested that the

Architectural Services Department ("ArchSD") should appoint a contractor to undertake projects that were similar in nature and implemented over the same period in a centralized manner to enhance the cost effectiveness of such projects. Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr WU Chi-wai were concerned about how FSTB prevented projects from being split and ensured the effective use of project expenses.

34. DS(Tsy)3/FSTB reiterated that the Administration had not split projects to include them under the block allocations proposal, and FSTB had always reminded the controlling officers concerned to implement projects in accordance with the established funding procedure to ensure that there would not be project splitting. DArchS said that the controlling officers would ensure that the cost of every item under the block allocations would not exceed the approved funding commitment. Government departments also engaged term contractors to implement various types of projects. As these contractors were granted a fixed payment to implement the related projects within a specified contract period, the project costs would not increase even if different projects were not implemented at the same time. In deciding whether various minor improvement projects should be implemented at the same time or at different times, ArchSD had to consider the impacts of such projects on departmental operation, in addition to the project costs.

35. The Chairman reiterated that since the project of quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay to be funded by an allocation from LF was not on the meeting agenda, members should follow up on the projects on other occasions. Ms Claudia Mo disagreed with the Chairman's point of view and said that since the allocations from LF would be used for funding capital works projects, members might raise related questions at the meeting.

36. Dr Junius HO and Mr LUK Chung-hung said that the construction of quarantine facilities was of utmost urgency and the construction works would be delayed by selecting the contractors through tendering. Dr HO opined that instead of focusing on whether the Administration should split projects and implement the projects of quarantine facilities through directly engaging contractors, members should contribute constructive views about disease prevention efforts. On the other hand, Mr LUK considered that the block allocations proposal was important to the employment of workers in the construction sector as a large number of minor works were involved. Therefore, the Chairman should not allow members to raise questions on the project of quarantine facilities at Penny's Bay, which was not related to the block allocations.

37. The Chairman said that he had reminded members not to raise questions unrelated to the agenda item.

Head 701 — Land Acquisition

*Subhead 1100CA — Compensation and ex-gratia allowances in respect of projects in the Public Works Programme*

38. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung expressed support for the block allocations proposal. Regarding the item on "Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area stage 1 works — site formation and engineering infrastructure", he relayed the comments from some local residents that the Administration had not yet confirmed the scope of land resumption for the proposed electricity substation involved in the project. Mr LEUNG enquired whether the Administration had consulted the affected land owners on the land resumption proposal, and whether it would confirm the scope of land resumption first, so that an accurate estimate could be made on the cost of land acquisition arising from the project.

39. DCED responded that "Hung Shui Kiu/Ha Tsuen New Development Area stage 1 works — site formation and engineering infrastructure" had been included in the agenda of the Subcommittee (i.e. [PWSC\(2019-20\)24](#)), and Subhead 1100CA under the block allocations was related to the cost of land acquisition arising from the project. Moreover, the Administration had maintained close liaison with Ping Shan Rural Committee and the local community regarding the land resumption for the proposed electricity substation. The Administration would explain in detail the communication carried out with residents on land resumption when the Subcommittee deliberated on the agenda item.

Head 703 — Buildings

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

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

40. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired about the scope of works of the item on "Refurbishment of windows to halls in Stanley Prison (project no. 008/20)", and whether the works would help improve the ventilation in Stanley Prison. DArchS responded that the works sought to replace the years-old iron window frames at Stanley Prison with those made of stainless steel in order to improve the ventilation of prison cells and strengthen security.

41. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the scope of works of the items on "Improvement works of dog kennel in Tuen Mun Police Station" and "Improvement works of dog kennel in Tsuen Wan Police Station". DArchS responded that the works involved installation of sound insulation facilities and air-conditioning system at the dog kennels in Tuen Mun and Tsuen Wan Police Stations in order to reduce the noise nuisance caused by the dog kennels to nearby residents.

42. At the request of Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, the Administration would provide supplementary information on the scope of works of the items on "Refurbishment of tennis court at roof and spectator stand at soccer pitch in Police Sports and Recreation Club, Mongkok (project no. 077/20)" and "Refurbishment of music room including finishes, ceiling and lighting system in Hong Kong Police College — Peter Moor Building Indoor Range, Wong Chuk Hang (project no. 139/20)", and the use of the music room in Peter Moor Building.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC105/19-20\(01\)](#) on 5 March 2020.)*

43. At the request of Mr CHU Hoi-dick, the Administration would provide supplementary information on whether block allocations would be used in future years for providing temporary "shipping container toilets" at public transport interchanges (e.g. the Lantau Link Toll Plaza and the Shing Mun Tunnels Bus Interchange) that were not yet equipped with public toilets; if so, the relevant details.

*(Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC105/19-20\(01\)](#) on 5 March 2020.)*

## Head 709 — Waterworks

### *Subhead 9100WX — Waterworks, studies and investigations for items in Category D of the Public Works Programme*

44. Dr Helena WONG was concerned that many buildings in To Kwa Wan district recently had a problem of intermittent flushing water supply. She enquired about the cause of the problem and the solution to it; the alternative funding sources for emergency repair works of fresh water and flushing water mains (such as those in To Kwa Wan as mentioned above) outside the scope of the block allocations proposal; and why the risk-based approach adopted by the Water Supplies Department ("WSD") for the



improvement works of water mains had failed to prevent the above problem as seen in To Kwa Wan.

45. Director of Water Supply said that there was sufficient flushing water pressure in To Kwa Wan district. WSD was in the process of investigating the problem of intermittent supply of flushing water in some buildings in the district, including checking the water supply network and whether there were alterations to the water supply systems within the buildings. WSD would reach out to local District Council members to explain the latest situation. Moreover, WSD was implementing a strategy for asset management of water mains adopting a risk-based approach, under which the risk of water mains was assessed on the basis of their materials, ages, past failure records, etc. and improvement works were carried out to the mains rated to be of high risk. Projects costing less than \$30 million would be included under the block allocations proposal while WSD would seek FC's funding approval for projects costing more than \$30 million. The Chairman suggested that members might follow up with the Administration on the cases after the meeting.

#### Head 708 (Part) — Capital Subventions

*Subhead 8100EX — Alterations, additions, repairs and improvements to the campuses of the UGC-funded institutions*

*Subhead 8100QX — Alterations, additions, repairs and improvements to education subvented buildings*

46. Mr Tony TSE enquired whether the scope of the alteration, addition, repair and improvement works to the campuses of institutions funded by the University Grants Committee ("UGC") under the block allocations proposal required adjustment as a result of the social incidents in recent months. Mr TSE also sought details of the items on "Renovation of a vacant school premises in Wong Tai Sin District (project no. 629)" and "Renovation of a vacant school premises in Kowloon City District (project no. 630)", including the uses of the school premises after renovation and when they would be put back into use.

47. Deputy Secretary-General (1), University Grants Committee Secretariat, responded that there were a total of 81 items on alterations, additions, repairs and improvements to the campuses of UGC-funded institutions in the next year, including 45 on-going items and 36 new items. These new items, being proposals submitted by the funded institutions to UGC in May 2019 (i.e. before the social incidents that began in June 2019), did not include the emergency repair works to the campuses required as a result of the social incidents in recent months. Upon recent inspection of

the actual conditions on the campuses, the funded institutions found that there were generally no implications on the implementation of the aforesaid 81 items. On the other hand, the funded institutions had also carried out emergency repair works to the damaged facilities on their own and most of the rehabilitation works had been completed. Chief Maintenance Surveyor (School Premises Maintenance), Education Bureau, replied that the vacant school premises in Wong Tai Sin and Kowloon City districts would be reallocated and continue to be used for school purpose after renovation. The renovation works concerned were expected to be completed in the third quarter of 2020.

### Head 711 — Housing

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

48. Mr Holden CHOW noted that the cost estimates of the investigation work for a number of public housing developments were close to the commitment ceiling (i.e. \$30 million) for each item under block allocations. He enquired about the Administration's counter measures in the event that the expenditure of such items exceeded \$30 million as a result of progress delay owing to the recent pandemic.

49. Chief Civil Engineer (Public Works Programme), Transport and Housing Bureau, said that the above investigation work had not been profoundly affected by the pandemic. Under the block allocations mechanism, however, an item should be upgraded to Category A and funding approval should be sought from FC separately if its expenditure exceeded \$30 million.

*[At 10:27 am, the Chairman asked members whether they agreed to extend the meeting for 15 minutes to 10:45 am, and no members raised objection.]*

*[At 10:43 am, the Chairman said that in view of the risk of holding meetings amidst the pandemic and the urgency of many items under the block allocations proposal, he would ask members who were waiting for their turn to raise questions whether they would consider following up on the matters on other occasions, so that the Subcommittee could proceed to vote on the agenda item at the meeting. Mr Abraham SHEK asked the Chairman to put the agenda item to vote.]*

*Mr CHU Hoi-dick opined that since the Administration had*

*commenced the construction works of the quarantine facilities under the block allocations proposal, there was no urgency for the Subcommittee to vote on the block allocations proposal at the meeting. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed a similar view. Ms Claudia MO said that the Chairman should ask members who were waiting for their turn to raise questions whether they would agree to give up on asking questions.]*

*[At 10:45 am, the Chairman asked members whether they agreed to further extend the meeting beyond 10:45 am in order to complete the voting on the item. Mr CHU Hoi-dick objected to further extending the meeting.]*

50. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would continue to discuss this item at the next meeting. Mr Abraham SHEK urged the Chairman to hold the next meeting as soon as possible. The meeting ended at 10:49 am.

*(Post-meeting note: The Administration issued a written notice to the Chairman on 28 February 2020 advising the withdrawal of the item. The letter was circulated to members vide [LC Paper No. PWSC103/19-20\(01\).](#))*

Council Business Division 1  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
23 July 2020