

**Confirmed Minutes of the 253rd Meeting
of the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE)
on 16 May 2022 at 2:30 p.m.**

Present:

Mr Stanley WONG, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Prof Nora TAM, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Ms Carmen CHAN, BBS, JP
Ms Sylvia CHAN, MH
Ms Ada FUNG, BBS
Ir Samantha KONG
Prof Alexis LAU, JP
Ms Julia LAU
Mr Andrew LEE
Prof Kenneth LEUNG, JP
Dr MA Kwan-ki
Dr Jeanne NG
Dr SUNG Yik-hei
Ms Christina TANG
Mr Simon WONG, BBS, JP
Dr WONG Kwok-yan, MH
Prof WONG Sze-chun, BBS, JP
Dr Raymond YAU
Mr Owin FUNG, JP (Secretary)

Absent with Apologies:

Ms LAM Chung-yan
Prof LAU Chi-pang, BBS, JP
Dr Winnie LAW

In Attendance:

Ms Maggie CHIN	Assistant Director of Planning / Technical Services, Planning Department
Miss Mavis HUI	Chief Information Officer, Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Ms Karen CHEK	Chief Executive Officer (CBD), EPD
Miss Sally SHEK	Executive Officer (CBD) 1, EPD
Miss Ingrid SUEN	Executive Officer (CBD) 2, EPD

In Attendance for Item 3:

Mr Bruno LUK, JP	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (Waste Reduction and Special Duties), EPD
Ms Iris LEE	Assistant Director (Waste Management Policy), EPD
Mr FONG Kin-wa, JP	Assistant Director (Waste Reduction and Recycling), EPD

In Attendance for Item 4:

Mr Victor YEUNG	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Regional Assessment), EPD
-----------------	---

Action

The Chairman welcomed Members for attending the meeting in person or by Zoom. He informed the meeting that apologies of absence had been received from Ms Lam Chung-yan, Prof Lau Chi-pang and Dr Winnie Law.

Item 1 : Confirmation of the draft minutes of the 252nd meeting held on 7 March 2022 (Closed-door session)

2. The draft minutes of the last meeting were confirmed without any proposed amendments.

Item 2 : Matters arising (Closed-door session)

3. There were no matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting.

Item 3 : Enhancement of the Plastic Shopping Bag Charging Scheme and the Plan on the Control of Single-use Plastics
(ACE Papers 4/2022 and 5/2022)

4. The Chairman referred Members to *ACE Paper 4/2022* which briefed them on the proposals for enhancing the Plastic Shopping Bag (PSB) Charging Scheme (the Scheme) and the plan on the control of single-use plastics further to the report and recommendations of the Council for Sustainable Development (SDC) on the subject. A background note on the subject (*ACE Paper 5/2022*) had been circulated to Members for reference before the meeting.

5. There was no declaration of interest by Members.

(The presentation team joined the meeting at this juncture.)

Presentation cum Question-and-Answer Session (Open session)

6. Mr Bruno Luk gave an opening remark and Ms Iris Lee briefed Members on the background, key points of the enhancement proposal of the Scheme and the planned control measures for single-use plastics with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

Key Performance Indicators

7. Members were in general supportive of the enhancement of the Scheme as well as the control measures proposed by the Government. To evaluate the effectiveness of the Scheme and the control measures, the Chairman and four Members suggested that the Government should devise a set of targets or key performance indicators (KPIs) on the expected level of reduction in PSBs and single-use plastics, and publish the relevant data after the implementation of the Scheme. One Member further suggested and echoed by another Member that a timetable should be devised to timely review the effectiveness of the Scheme and the need to further adjust the charging level.

8. Mr Bruno Luk responded that the Government had all along been monitoring the effectiveness of the Scheme by conducting annual PSB landfill survey, and would continue to keep in view relevant data for evaluating the effectiveness of the proposed enhancement measures. That said, in view of the substantial increase in takeaway meal orders during the pandemic, relevant data would need to be suitably adjusted before adoption. Mr Luk added that the Government would monitor the effectiveness of the enhancement measures regularly and adjust the charging level as and when necessary.

9. In response to a Member's enquiry about the possibility to devise KPIs for measuring green consumer behavioural changes, Mr Bruno Luk indicated that the reduction in the use and disposal of PSBs could be one of the measuring parameters and suitable surveys could be carried out in the future to evaluate public behavioural change.

10. A Member enquired about the expected level of reduction in the disposal of PSBs upon raising the charge from at least \$0.5 to at least \$1 per PSB. Mr Bruno

Luk said that a significant drop in PSBs disposal was observed after the full implementation of the Scheme in the entire retail sector in 2015. Based on previous experience, the current Scheme was expected to help bring similar results. He further shared that according to the survey conducted by the SDC, many people indicated that they would give a second thought before buying a PSB if the charging level was increased to \$1 per PSB.

PSB Charging Scheme

11. Noting that free PSBs could be provided for carrying food and beverage (F&B) takeaway items with conditions (e.g. one free bag for carrying all exempted items unless the bag was full), a Member enquired whether restaurants could charge their customers for the PSBs that could be legally exempted. Mr Bruno Luk replied that, under the present Scheme, restaurants/retail outlets could charge their customers on the PSBs that were legally exempted, and this arrangement would remain the same in the future.

12. To help reduce plastic wastes, a Member suggested that the PSBs sold in retail outlets under the Scheme should also be used as designated garbage bags under the Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Charging Scheme to be implemented in 2023. Mr Bruno Luk said that the Government had approached retailers on this and received positive responses from some major retailers. The Government would continue to rally support from more retailers on offering designated garbage bags at cashiers in lieu of PSBs.

13. In response to a Member's suggestion of a grace period for the relevant trade and the public to get prepared for the enhancement measures, Mr Bruno Luk said that the Government would provide guidelines and step up public education and publicity before the target implementation of the Scheme in the end of 2022.

14. To prepare the public for the Scheme, a Member suggested that the flat-top plastic bags used in the supermarkets should be controlled and provided only upon request at cashier counters. Mr Bruno Luk said that the Government had already written to the relevant trades to promote good practices, such as providing flat-top plastic bags only upon request at the cashier counters.

15. Noting a Member's concern on the removal of exemption for PSBs for carrying frozen foodstuff items, Mr Bruno Luk said that the proposed removal of

exemption was in line with the arrangements in other places as frozen food items were generally in airtight packaging or properly packaged. While the Member indicated that used flat-top plastic bags could be reused for disposing of food waste, Mr Luk stressed that the ultimate goal was to minimise the generation and consumption of PSBs at source. Mr Luk shared the good practice of bringing one's own waterproof reusable insulation bags to carry wet, messy or frozen items such that there would be no need to use PSBs. The Chairman agreed that using insulation bags for carrying frozen foodstuff items was preferable to flat-top plastic bags.

16. A Member suggested that the Government should include other non-degradable alternatives of plastic bags such as non-woven bags in the proposed legislation to prevent the surge in their use as a substitute for PSBs. With reference to the practices of other places, Mr Bruno Luk responded that strengthening public education and promoting waste reduction at source would be the top priority at the current stage. The Chairman noted that it would usually take time to regulate new product items in the market. He hoped that suitable measures could be implemented in the future for the excessive distribution of non-woven bags in the society.

Enforcement actions

17. While supporting the proposals, the Chairman and a Member expressed concern that the public might shift their shopping activities to online platforms to avoid the charging of PSBs and the Government was suggested to devise a plan to tackle the potential waste problem arising from online shopping. Mr Bruno Luk advised Members that the PSBs for online shopping was subject to the existing legislation and enforcement actions such as compliance checks and mystery shopping would continue to be carried out after the implementation of the enhanced Scheme. He supplemented that the Government had written to major retailers with online shopping platforms on the Scheme to facilitate their early preparation. The Government had maintained close communications with these retailers to encourage them to use less PSBs and packaging.

18. In response to a Member's suggestion, Mr Bruno Luk confirmed that compliance checks and mystery shopping would also be carried out to monitor the compliance of retail outlets and enforcement actions would be strengthened upon the implementation of the Scheme. Another Member remarked that enforcement

actions and strict penalty should be adopted to ensure the compliance of retail outlets. Mr Luk advised Members that retailers contravening the requirement to charge for PSBs under the Scheme was liable to a fine at level 6 (HK\$100,000) on first conviction and HK\$200,000 on each subsequent conviction; or a fixed penalty of HK\$2,000.

Control Measures on Single-Use Plastic Products

19. A Member suggested that the Government should devise control measures for excessive packaging of foodstuff items and encourage the reuse and recycling of such packaging. Mr Bruno Luk explained that as a wide range of sectors and types of packaging were involved, the Government would liaise with the relevant trades on the appropriate regulatory or control measures.

20. A Member shared that disposable plastic tableware was often provided even when the customers had declined them in their takeaway orders. She therefore suggested introducing suitable measures to address this situation. Mr Bruno Luk said that according to the Scheme on Regulation of Disposable Plastic Tableware proposed by the Government earlier, the provision of disposable plastic tableware by catering premises to customers would be banned for dine-in and takeaways services in phases.

21. Three Members suggested that non-medical disposable gloves for food preparation and scientific research as well as rubber gloves for household use should be exempted from the proposed ban on sale. Another Member reminded the Government to take into account the need of using single-use plastic gloves for personal hygiene during the pandemic. Mr Bruno Luk explained that the policy intent was to stop the indiscriminate use of single-use plastic gloves, and suitable exemptions would be provided for essential uses, such as for medical and hygiene purposes. He added that detailed definition and scope of the proposed control scheme would be set out clearly in the legislation being prepared.

22. A Member sought more information about the oxo-degradable plastic products to be regulated. Mr Bruno Luk explained that oxo-degradable plastic products would break down into tiny plastic fragments with time. As they might cause more environmental problems like microplastic pollution, there had been a trend for banning the manufacturing, sale and distribution of oxo-degradable plastic products in other places.

23. Pointing out that cotton buds, dental floss and ear plugs were daily necessity items, a Member sought details of the regulation in this respect. Mr Bruno Luk explained that only those products made of plastics or with plastic components would be banned and their non-plastic alternatives, such as bamboo cotton buds, would not be banned under the proposed control scheme.

24. In reply to a Member's enquiry regarding tissue paper with plastic packaging, Mr Bruno Luk explained that tissue paper packs with plastic packaging as part of the products sold would not be banned whereas those distributed primarily for promotion purposes would be banned.

25. In response to a Member's request for statistics on the waste plastics disposed of during the pandemic, Mr Fong Kin-wa revealed that according to the Waste Statistics 2020, on average around 266 tonnes of plastic/polyfoam tableware were disposed of at landfills daily in 2020, which was about 30% more than in 2019. He said that the increase could be attributed to the surge in demand for takeaway services during the pandemic.

26. A Member observed that the wide use of rapid antigen test kits used under the pandemic led to the generation of a large amount of plastic wastes and suggested the Government to explore with the manufacturers on suitable ways to reduce the plastic materials used. Mr Bruno Luk responded that the test kits were sourced worldwide from a wide range of manufacturers to meet the urgent needs of the society. While the Government might explore ways to reduce relevant wastes in the long run, in the meantime, the public could suitably recycle certain uncontaminated components of the kit as far as practicable through existing recycling channels, say, the paper instructions and exterior packaging, but it was not suitable to recycle components that might have been contaminated on public health ground.

27. A Member remarked that the Government should set an example in reducing the use of plastics and packaging in its daily business, in particular procurement guidelines should be issued for reducing the packaging of anti-epidemic kits and encouraging the use of reusable plastics. Mr Fong Kin-wa advised Members that the Government had put in place a green procurement policy for bureaux/departments to avoid the procurement of disposable products, such as plastic bags, as far as practicable.

Publicity and Public Education

28. A Member shared with Members a survey conducted by the World Economic Forum, which indicated that less than 20% of the respondents practised green consumer behaviours. While supportive of raising the charging level of PSBs, the Chairman and three Members opined that the disincentive effect of the proposed increase in the charging level to \$1 per PSB would be limited and short-term. They considered that continuous efforts and resources in public education and engagement would bring more impact to drive fundamental attitudinal and behavioral changes. Mr Bruno Luk affirmed that the Government would spare no efforts in public education and publicity, which were of paramount importance. The Government would also take reference from the recommendation of the SDC on developing a platform to facilitate information-sharing on non-plastic alternatives available in the market.

29. A Member further suggested the Government to encourage innovative design and ideas of green living habits, such as reusable umbrella bags, through publicity initiatives. Mr Bruno Luk indicated that the Government would explore innovative alternatives and promote them through suitable publicity events.

Provision of Incentives

30. Apart from regulation and control measures, a Member suggested and echoed by another Member that positive incentives such as rebates could be provided to the relevant trades and consumers to encourage green behaviours. While positive incentives would not be stipulated in the legislation being prepared, Mr Bruno Luk said that the Government would continue to liaise with the retail industry to encourage their participation in reducing plastic waste by providing suitable incentives to customers. He supplemented that EPD had put in efforts to expand the community recycling network GREEN@COMMUNITY to provide incentives for recycling.

Conclusion

31. The Chairman thanked the Government representatives for their presentation and detailed explanations, and concluded that Members were in general supportive of the proposal for enhancing the Scheme as well as the plan on the control of single-use plastics. He hoped that the Government would consider

Members' suggestions, in particular on devising KPIs and strengthening publicity and public education, when finalising the details of the Scheme.

Internal Discussion Session (Closed-door session)

32. In reply to a Member's enquiry about the Government's plan to regulate excessive packaging for retail industry, Mr Bruno Luk explained that the matter would be considered separately in the near future. The Member stressed that the Government should regulate and impose strict measures to discourage excessive packaging.

33. In response to a Member's question, Mr Bruno Luk explained that the PSB charge would be kept by the retail outlets. Pointing out that offering discount for "less rice" option in some restaurants was well-received, the Chairman suggested providing rebates or financial incentives to consumers with a view to encouraging waste reduction at source. Mr Luk said that EPD could liaise with the relevant trades, particularly the supermarkets, to encourage them to provide rebates or discounts for green consumer behaviours.

34. Mr Bruno Luk remarked that the Government targeted to submit the proposals for enhancement of the PSB Charging Scheme, including to increase the charging level to at least \$1 per PSB as well as to remove and tighten certain exemptions, to the Legislative Council (LegCo) around June 2022. Subject to the progress of LegCo's scrutiny, the enhancement measures would be implemented in late 2022 the earliest.

Conclusion

35. The Chairman concluded the discussion and invited the Government to take on board the views and suggestions made by Members during the discussion.

(The presentation team left the meeting and Mr Victor Yeung joined the meeting at this juncture.)

Item 4 : Report on the 152nd Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee Meeting held on 11 April 2022 (Closed-door session)

(ACE Paper 6/2022)

36. Subsequent to the discussion of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report on “Tung Chung Line Extension” (TCLE) at the 152nd EIA subcommittee (EIASC) meeting on 11 April 2022, the Chairman informed Members that some 70 emails from members of the public and a letter from the Tung Chung Crescent (TCC) Residential Owners’ Sub-committee were received before the current meeting. The ACE was requested to withhold processing the agenda item on the grounds that the Council was not provided with comprehensive public comments by the EPD for consideration of the matter. The relevant e-mails and letter had been passed to all Members for perusal before the meeting.

37. The Chairman and EIASC Chairperson reminded Members of the statutory procedures under the EIA Ordinance (EIAO). Members were aware that in accordance with the EIAO procedures, the public should submit their comments on the EIA report to the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) within the stipulated public inspection period. The DEP would then pass a summary of the public comments received as well as all the comments to the EIASC Members to facilitate their deliberation at the EIASC meeting following the agreed protocol. As all the public comments received were provided to the EIASC, and there was no precedence nor jurisdiction in the statutory process for the ACE to withhold processing the agenda item to consider the late public comments, the meeting agreed to continue to process the item.

38. The EIASC Chairperson reported that the EIA report on “TCLE” submitted by the MTR Corporation Limited was made available for public inspection for a period of 30 days from 10 February to 11 March 2022 in accordance with the EIAO. The inspection period was later extended from 23 March 2022 to 1 April 2022 as a result of the proponent’s failure to provide timely response through their hotline due to their work from home arrangement during pandemic. As stipulated under section 7(2) of the EIAO, members of the public should provide their written comments on the EIA report before the period of public inspection expired. During the two public inspection periods, a total of 317 sets of public comments (inclusive of 137 sets of standard letters and 1 set of 269 survey returns supporting the project) were received by EPD and they had been passed to the EIASC Members for consideration before the EIASC meeting.

39. The EIASC Chairperson went on to report that during the EIASC meeting held on 11 April 2022, Members had meticulously discussed the various concerns of the public, including those of the TCC residents ranging from the location of the

launching shaft, alignment options, noise and air pollution, traffic arrangement to the project programme. After deliberation, the EIASC considered that the project proponent had complied with the statutory requirements under the EIAO and unacceptable environmental impact was not expected. As such, the EIASC recommended the full Council to endorse the EIA report with four conditions and three recommendations as set out in paragraph 8 of *ACE paper 6/2022* with a view to minimising the possible impacts of the project to the environment and the neighbouring residents. The project proponent was not required to attend the full Council meeting. An extract of the relevant discussions was published on the ACE's website and at Annex B to *ACE paper 6/2022*.

40. The Chairman noted that the proposed conditions and recommendations were meant to address the possible impacts the project. In particular, the proposed set up of liaison groups was to ensure continual communication between the project proponent and the local residents to address different issues. The above notwithstanding, the Chairman considered it prudent for Members to take the opportunity to review the conditions and recommendations put forward by the EIASC and to see if any major public comments received during the specified public inspection period were yet to be addressed. To comply with the statutory procedures without setting any undesirable disruption and precedence, Members agreed that those public comments received after the statutory public inspection periods would not be accepted unless there were issues arising from the previous EIASC meeting which required reconsideration.

41. In response to a Member's enquiry on precedence for handling late public comments, Mr Victor Yeung said that the public consultation process under the EIAO EIA report approval procedures comprised two parts. One part of the comments came from members of the public during a 30-day public inspection period whereas the other part was from the ACE within a 60-day ACE consultation period. The DEP should consider the comments of both parts before making a decision. Mr Yeung confirmed that there was no requirement under the EIAO for the ACE to consider public comments submitted outside the statutory inspection period.

42. A Member thanked the EIASC Chairperson for her detailed briefing on the project and the EIAO process. The Member and another Member agreed that the EIASC had thorough deliberation on the project and the proposed conditions and recommendations had taken into account the concerns of the TCC residents. The Member further remarked that it should be clarified in the minutes that the EIASC

had considered all the public comments received on the project and the claimed statements of the TCC residents in the recent correspondences were not true.

43. The EIASC Chairperson took the opportunity to clarify again that the EIASC had considered all those public comments received by EPD during the public inspection periods. During the EIASC meeting, Members had drilled in details the different aspects of the project. The Chairperson added that the EIASC Members had studied diligently the information provided in the EIA report, layout plans, public comments as well as other relevant documents and sought clarifications from the project proponent on areas which were not clear. The project proponent had confirmed that the proposed construction of the launching shaft at TCC would be the best option amongst the three illustrated in the EIA report as it would bring the least environmental impact with a shorter overall project programme. After considering the findings of the EIA report, the justifications provided by the project proponent as well as the public comments received during the public inspection periods, the EIASC supported endorsing the EIA report with conditions and recommendations for the greater good of the society as a whole though they were empathetic towards the TCC residents.

44. A Member enquired whether the project proponent or EPD would be required to respond to the late public comments. Mr Victor Yeung advised the meeting that under the EIAO process, neither the project proponent nor EPD was required to provide responses, though it was a legal requirement for the EPD to consider all the public comments received during the public inspection period as well as the comments of the ACE before making its decision on an EIA report. Mr Yeung added that even though some of the public comments were outside the scope of the EIAO mechanism, EPD would relay them to the project proponent for consideration. The Member hoped that the project proponent would give due consideration to the views on the technical aspects though they were outside the scope of the EIAO and proactively gauge the views of the public through the proposed liaison group.

45. The Chairman shared his previous experience in the Town Planning Board (TPB) where thousands of public comments could be received on consultations. He said that as a general practice, no individual responses would be given to the comments collected in consultation exercises. The Chairman added that under the legal framework of the EIAO, there was a specific period for the general public to give their views and it was important to ensure that public views could be expressed

and considered on a fair basis across different projects. In the current case, the EPD had provided all public comments received during the public inspection periods to the EIASC for consideration. The ACE would then consider the views of the EIASC and prepare its recommendations to the EPD as an independent advisory body. Members were aware that the ACE was not required to consider those late comments while major public views would not be overlooked.

46. After revisiting the public comments received during the public inspection periods, a Member highlighted that some members of the public were worried that there might be prejudicial interest for the project proponent to engage the same consultant, i.e. Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited, for both the project design and the preparation of the EIA report.

47. The Chairman opined and a Member echoed that there should be no major concern as the information on the consultants engaged for the project was made available to the public. The EIASC Chairperson remarked that the EIASC Members had been informed of the consultants for the EIA report at the EIASC meeting. She pointed out and echoed by another Member that the EIASC had deliberated the project professionally based on the objective findings and content of the EIA report whereas the company responsible for preparing the EIA report or designing the project was not a factor for consideration.

48. While a Member agreed that Members had considered the EIA report objectively based on the scientific findings, she understood that the public might have a negative impression about having the same company for both the EIA report as well as the project design. As such, she suggested the EPD to consider including a restriction on engaging the same consultant in the different processes of a project in the relevant guidelines in future.

49. The Chairperson was of the view that there might be practical difficulty to impose such restriction given that many EIA projects might be handled by a few leading companies in the industry. Mr Victor Yeung said that there was no legal restriction in the EIAO process that required the project proponent to engage different consultants for the same project. He pointed out that inclusion of environmental consultants in the project design team could allow the consultants to advise on the environmental issues early in the design stage, which could be beneficial to the project. He stressed that EPD together with other relevant authorities would act as the gatekeeper for vetting the EIA report submitted by the

project proponent in accordance with the Technical Memorandum and the EIAO. The consultants engaged by the project proponent would not affect the professional judgment of the relevant authorities in ensuring the compliance of the relevant regulations.

50. On the landscape impact, a Member noted that that some TCC residents considered the photomontage in the EIA report somewhat misleading with regard to the height of the noise enclosure. Another Member suggested that the project proponent should minimise the landscape impact of the proposed noise enclosure at TCC.

51. As pointed out by the EIASC Chairperson and a Member, a condition had already been proposed which required the project proponent to provide details of the extent of the noise enclosure to minimise the possible nuisance to the TCC residents and the dimension of the noise enclosure would need to be submitted to the satisfaction of DEP. Mr Victor Yeung supplemented that a recommendation instead of a condition imposing restrictions on the landscape aspect would be more appropriate as there was no unacceptable landscape impact arising from the project. The Chairman proposed and the EIASC Chairperson echoed that the landscape impact might be incorporated in one of the proposed recommendations.

52. While the project proponent had given a full account of the impact on the natural environment, a Member was of the view that the project proponent should give more meticulous consideration on the possible nuisances brought to the TCC residents. With a view to addressing the concerns of the TCC residents, another Member suggested with the support of two Members that a condition rather than a recommendation should be imposed for the project proponent to set up a liaison group for communication with the stakeholders on handling various issues arising from the project.

53. To address the concern of the TCC residents regarding the construction time, a Member reiterated that the project proponent should be required to explore ways to reduce the construction time as far as possible. The EIASC Chairperson pointed out that a recommendation had been proposed for the project proponent to explore ways to enhance environmental quality which included the reduction of construction time. Another Member added that the proposed condition on the noise enclosure required the project proponent to submit the programme of erection and demolition

of the enclosure and site reinstatement to the DEP for approval in the hope of reducing the construction time as far as possible.

54. The EIASC Chairperson enquired whether there was precedence for including the setup of stakeholders liaison groups as a condition in previous projects. Mr Victor Yeung confirmed that such conditions had been included in the environmental permits in the past. The meeting also noted that the ACE had put forward similar conditions to the DEP in its previous submissions.

55. With reference to the past experience, the Chairperson and EIASC Chairperson suggested with the support of Members that paragraph 8(v) of ACE Paper 6/2022 where the project proponent was recommended to “*put in place a mechanism, such as through setting up liaison groups, for maintaining regular communication with the local and relevant stakeholders on issues concerning noise, air, traffic and recreational spaces arising from the Project*” should be revised as a condition where the project proponent should “***set up a community liaison group, for maintaining regular communication with the local and relevant stakeholders on issues concerning noise, air, traffic, landscape and recreational spaces arising from the Project.***”

56. The EIASC Chairperson concurred with three Members that the comments received in the preceding few days did not contain new information as compared with those received during the public inspection periods. After careful deliberations, Members were satisfied that the major concerns of the TCC residents expressed during the public inspection periods were taken into account and transcribed into the proposed conditions and recommendations made by the EIASC. With no further comments from Members, the Chairman concluded that the meeting agreed to recommend the DEP to endorse the EIA report with five conditions and two recommendations after incorporating the amendments proposed in this meeting.

(Post-meeting notes: Members proposed further amendments to the condition regarding the community liaison group after the meeting. The following condition was agreed by way of circulation via email –

“The project proponent shall set up a community liaison group, for maintaining regular communication with the local and relevant stakeholders on issues concerning noise, air, traffic, waste management, landscape and recreational spaces etc. arising from the project, and handling complaints on environmental issues

related to the project. The project proponent shall take a proactive approach to disseminate information to the group, promote community cooperation and participation and implement suitable local environmental enhancement works. All relevant information of the Project including the progress of construction and operation and environmental monitoring and audit results shall be provided to the group.”)

57. The Chairman indicated that the discussion at the meeting was useful to clarify the EIAO mechanism to facilitate the Council’s business in the future.

Item 5 : Any other business (Closed-door session)

58. There was no other business for discussion at the meeting.

Item 6 : Date of next meeting (Closed-door session)

59. The next ACE meeting was scheduled for 13 June 2022 (Monday). Members would be advised on the agenda in due course.

(Post-meeting notes: As there was no proposed item for discussion at the ACE meeting, the meeting scheduled for June and July had been cancelled. The next ACE meeting was scheduled for 8 August 2022.)

**ACE Secretariat
August 2022**