

**Confirmed Minutes of the 109th Meeting of
the Advisory Council on the Environment
held on 13 October 2003 at 2:30 p.m.**

Present:

Prof. LAM Kin-che, J.P. (Chairman)
Prof. Peter HILLS
Prof. HO Kin-chung
Mr. Peter Y. C. LEE
Mr. LIN Chaan-ming
Dr. NG Cho-nam
Mrs. Mei NG, B.B.S
Mr. Otto L. T. POON, B.B.S.
Ms. Iris TAM, J.P.
Prof. WONG Tze-wai
Miss Petula Poon (Acting Secretary)

Absent with Apologies:

Prof. LUNG Ping-yee, David, S.B.S., J.P.
Mr. Michael J. D. RUSHWORTH
Mr. Markus SHAW
Prof. WONG Yuk-shan, J.P.

In Attendance:

Dr. Sarah LIAO, J.P.	Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works
Mr. Paul TANG, J.P.	Acting Permanent Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment and Transport)
Ms. Doris CHEUNG	Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment and Transport)(E)1,
Mr. Thomas CHOW	Deputy Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment and Transport)(E)2,
Mr. Mike STOKOE, J.P.	Acting Director of Environmental Protection
Mr. C C LAY	Assistant Director (Conservation), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department
Dr. Amy CHIU	Assistant Director (Health Administration and Planning), Department of Health
Miss CHU Hing-yin	Chief Town Planner/Technical Services, Planning Department
Mr. Roy TANG	Administrative Assistant to Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works
Ms. Jenny CHAN	Acting Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment & Transport) E 4

Mr. Matthew LEUNG	Secretariat Press Officer (Environment, Transport and Works), Environment, Transport and Works Bureau (ETWB)
Mrs. Pauline LING	Press Secretary to Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works
Ms. Polly LEUNG	Principal Information Officer, Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Mr. Eddie CHENG	Executive Officer (E), ETWB

In Attendance for Agenda Item 3 :

Ms. Ava CHIU	Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment & Transport) T3,
Mr. WAN Man-leung	Deputy Project Manager/Major Works (2) Highways Department (HyD)
Mr. LAU Wan-cheung	Senior Engineer/Special Duties, HyD

In Attendance for Agenda Item 4 :

Dr. K M CHOY	Executive Manager (Professional Services), Hospital Authority (HA)
Mr. Raymond WONG	Senior Executive Manager (Business Support), HA
Mr. Ambrose LAM	Hospital Administrator (Business Support Services), HA

In Attendance for Agenda Item 6 :

Ms. Annie CHOI	Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (Environment & Transport) E2,
Mr. Henry C Y CHAN	Chief Engineer/Port Works, Civil Engineering Department (CED)

In Attendance for Agenda Item 7 :

Mr. John CHAI, JP	Director of Territory Development
Mr. T Y CHEUNG, JP	Project Manager/HK Island & Islands, Territory Development Department (TDD)
Mr. Benny WONG	Assistant Director (Waste and Water), EPD
Mr. K F TANG	Senior Engineer, TDD

Action

The Chairman welcomed Dr. Sarah Liao, Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works to the meeting. He informed Members

that the Chief Executive had appointed Mr. Markus Shaw, Chairman of the World Wide Fund For Nature (Hong Kong), as Member of the Council on an ad personam basis for the period from 9 October 2003 to 31 December 2004. In addition, the Chairman congratulated Prof. Ho Kin-chung and the Green Power on the latter's receiving the China Environmental Award granted by the China Environmental Protection Foundation in Beijing. Prof. Ho thanked the Chairman and expressed gratitude for the support of the Council and other green groups in Hong Kong.

Agenda Item 1 : Confirmation of Minutes of the 108th Meeting held on 10 September 2003

2. The draft minutes were confirmed by Members subject to the amendment proposed by a Member that the words "She also proposed that ETWB should form a taskforce to co-ordinate the work of the relevant bureaux and departments in the implementation of the nature conservation policy." should be added to the end of paragraph 33 of the minutes.

Agenda Item 2 : Matters Arising

Para. 39: To write to the Transport Sub-branch of ETWB to reflect Members' reservation on the proposed Public Transport Interchange (PTI) at Lok Ma Chau Terminus of the Sheung Shui to Lok Ma Chau Spur Line

3. The Chairman informed Members that the Secretariat had written to the Transport Sub-branch to reflect Members' reservation, and the Transport Sub-branch's reply was circulated to them on 19 September 2003.

4. Upon a Member's enquiry, Mr. Paul Tang informed Members that the PTI project would be taken forward through an application for variation to the Environmental Permit for the Spur Line project but KCRC had not yet submitted the application to DEP. The Member expressed disappointment because under that approach, the public as well as the Council would not have the opportunity to comment on the application. In response, Mr. Tang explained that the permit variation approach was considered appropriate having regard to the fact that the environmental impacts arising from the PTI would be insignificant. He said that the Subcommittee would be briefed again if they had further questions on the project.

5. A Member expressed the wish that Members could provide input on the imposition of conditions on the Environment Permit before the application for variation was approved. Mr. Mike Stokoe said that although the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Ordinance did not require the authorities to take into account views expressed on the conditions of

approval before approving the application, and there were no formal channels for expressing such views, Members were welcome to put forward their views, and EPD would take them into consideration. The Member stressed that the Spur Line was a controversial project and it would be inappropriate for the project to adopt a permit variation approach since it would bypass the public scrutiny process. Mr. Mike Stokoe said that EPD had considered the issue carefully and believed that it was the right way to proceed because the PTI was part of the railway development and variation to the Environmental Permit for the railway development was appropriate. He assured Members that EPD would take into account any comments Members had to raise on the application, and consider very carefully what conditions should be imposed. The Chairman hoped EPD would consider Members' views and take every measure to avoid public impression that the consultation mechanism had been bypassed.

Para. 40: To circulate EPD's letter to MTRC for the permission to apply directly for the Environmental Permit

6. The Chairman informed Members that the letter was circulated to them on 3 October 2003.

Agenda Item 3 : The Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge
(ACE Paper 27/2003)

7. The Chairman welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. He invited Dr. Sarah Liao to introduce the background of the project, and Ms. Ava Chiu and Mr. Wan Man-leung to brief Members on the details of the project.

8. In response to a Member's question, Ms. Ava Chiu explained that the aim of the study jointly commissioned by HKSARG and the mainland authorities was to assess the need for the bridge and hence there was more emphasis on the economic factors. She said that the Administration had separately completed a Preliminary Environmental Review on the possible landing points of the project and the alignments of the connecting infrastructure with preliminary assessment on the technical and environmental issues. The review aimed at identifying the areas for more intensive EIA study. In response to the Chairman's request, Dr. Sarah Liao agreed to make available the findings of the Preliminary Environmental Review report to Members for information. The report should be kept confidential because the information was preliminary in nature.

ETWB

9. In response to a Member's enquiry on the possibility of gaining access to the report of the EIA study conducted by the Mainland and sharing data on environmental monitoring, Ms. Ava Chiu said that HKSARG

would contribute to one third of the cost of the study conducted by the Mainland and hence access to the study result would be easier. Dr. Sarah Liao added that the EIA study would be part of the feasibility study required by the Mainland authorities in creating an item for the project. The Mainland side would conduct formal consultation sessions on the results of the study. She would see to it that the Council would have the opportunity to participate in the consultation process as far as possible. The Chairman agreed with a Member's remarks that it might be too late for the Council to participate in the formal consultation sessions and that the Mainland should provide interim reports, if possible.

ETWB

10. Noting that by 2010, there would be 33 millions to 41 millions of passengers using the bridge each year, a Member asked about the estimated number of the different types of vehicles. In response, Ms. Ava Chiu said that according to a crude analysis conducted, there would be about 12,000 to 16,000 vehicular trips per day by 2010. The existing infrastructure network would be able to cope with the increased traffic with no difficulty.

11. A Member supported the project. He pointed out that the bridge would be used heavily by goods vehicles as western Zhuhai was an industrial area. He suggested building an additional landing point in Tuen Mun to facilitate goods vehicles to go to the container terminal at Kwai Chung. Mr. Paul Tang said that landing the bridge in Tuen Mun was not feasible due to technical and environmental problems. However, there were preliminary plans to connect North West Lantau to North West New Territories by building a bridge or a tunnel between North West Lantau and Tuen Mun. There was also plan to strengthen the connection between North West Lantau and the urban area to facilitate access by container vehicles to Kwai Chung.

12. A Member said that the impact of the increased traffic flow on Lantau Island should be looked at carefully. She suggested building a short cut to direct the traffic away from North Lantau Island. Also, there should be infrastructure connecting the bridge to the railways. She wondered whether the EIA study would include all those projects. In response, Mr. Paul Tang said that the EIA study would cover the Hong Kong section of the bridge as well as its connecting infrastructure. Major expansions of the transport network would be done gradually and separate EIA studies would be conducted. Another Member said that the EIA study of the Hong Kong side should cover the increased traffic flow from North Lantau to the container terminal in Kwai Chung.

13. Two Members expressed concerns about the transport planning and strategic development planning of Lantau Island. Dr. Sarah

Liao agreed that the Council should have the opportunity to look at the overall strategic development of Lantau Island so as to give input at an early planning stage. The Chairman said that a discussion on the strategic development of Lantau Island would be useful and hoped that the Planning Department could follow up on the matter.

Planning
Department

14. A Member pointed out that the proposed project would bring about a 40% increase in the demand for container service in the Kwai Chung container terminal. He wondered whether there was sufficient container handling capacity to meet the demand and was concerned that the increased container traffic in North Lantau might not be desirable. In response, Dr. Sarah Liao said that the container terminal business was one of the major sources of income for Hong Kong and there had been increasing competition from ports in the neighbouring areas. The proposed project would shorten the distance between the industrial areas in Western Zhuhai and Hong Kong and would give Hong Kong an edge on container terminal business. Mr. Paul Tang added that the capacity of the existing container terminal and the need for new facilities were being studied by the Economic Development and Labour Bureau.

15. A Member expressed concerns on the air quality impact of the project as the ozone level in Tung Chung had recorded 35 exceedences in 2002. In response, Dr. Sarah Liao said that the air quality impact of the project would be looked at very carefully. In parallel, the Mainland was tightening the control on vehicle emissions.

16. A Member pointed out that since a large part of the project lied outside Hong Kong, it would be difficult to implement administrative measures to control the traffic volume. At present, road-based traffic was predominant in the Mainland and there was increasing number of private cars. He believed that the eventual traffic flow would be greater than predicted, and it would be disastrous if the North Lantau Expressway that served the airport was congested by cross boundary traffic.

17. The Chairman thanked the Administration for briefing the Council on the project and looked forward to receiving the Preliminary Environmental Review report. He confirmed that the Council endorsed the proposed selected area for conducting an EIA study on the bridge and the connecting infrastructure within Hong Kong. He hoped that the Administration would take into account Members' concerns about the air quality impact of the project and the need for strategic planning of Lantau Island. In addition, he looked forward to a discussion with the Administration on the overall development of the Lantau Island in due course.

Agenda Item 4 : Hospital Authority (HA) – Pledge and achievements on environmental management initiatives

(ACE Paper 29/2003)

18. The Chairman welcomed the presentation team. Dr. K M Choy briefed Members on HA's initiatives on environmental management and the handling of clinical waste.

19. In response to a Member's enquiry on the performance of Hong Kong's hospitals in reducing clinical waste as compared with the international standard, Mr. Raymond Wong said that before the episode on Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), figures showed that Hong Kong was one of the best in the world as far as clinical waste reduction was concerned. However, after the SARS episode, the figures had to be looked at again due to the increased use of less environmental friendly products in hospitals.

20. In reply to a Member's enquiry, Mr. Raymond Wong said that they had no plan at the moment to compulsorily require hospitals to obtain the ISO 14001 accreditation. They would leave the matter to individual hospitals but HA would always provide support to them.

21. In response to a Member's enquiry about the disinfection and recycling of personal protective equipment, Mr. Raymond Wong said that after the SARS episode, HA was working with local institutes on the subject. They had to make sure that the equipment were safe and cost effective before using them in hospitals.

22. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Dr. K M Choy said that the HA used ordinary glass bottles and hoped that recycling of glass bottles was available in Hong Kong.

23. A Member asked whether HA had adopted energy saving measures such as shading off sunshine to reduce electricity consumption in air conditioning and whether consideration had been given to using solar panels for outdoor lighting. She asked about the disposal of disinfection materials such as chlorinated compounds and whether there was any plan to reduce the usage of plastic bags and, where appropriate, reuse plastic bottles. She referred to a new technology called photocatalytic disinfection and asked whether it was environmental friendly and cost effective. In response, Mr. Raymond Wong said that they had considered using solar panels but had not yet identified suitable places for using them. They had requested their architects to adopt designs that could reduce electricity consumption. As regards effluent discharge, the laundry systems of HA hospitals were equipped with effluent discharge treatment facilities. However, some

chemicals discharged from laboratories had to rely on natural dilution but they would conduct regular checking by testing samples collected in manholes. They were aware of the photocatalytic disinfection technology but had to wait for more research analysis to prove that it was cost-effective. As regards reusing plastic bottles, Mr. Raymond Wong said that they did encourage patients to bring back used bottles for recycling but much would depend on their cooperation. It might not be possible to reduce the use of plastic bags, as they could not find other suitable replacement materials.

24. Noting that the public had used more anti-mosquito spray recently, a Member asked whether HA had done any assessment and monitoring on the residue of the spray. In response, Mr. Raymond Wong said that HA would only use chemicals that were approved by AFCD. At present, they were experimenting a new spray that could be applied to drainage systems to prevent mosquito breeding. Another Member pointed out that pesticides could not kill adult mosquito but instead would cause harmful effects to the environment. He considered it more effective to use preventive measures such as regular checking to empty stagnant water from household containers.

25. A Member informed Members that EPD was preparing a set of guidelines on indoor air quality in hospitals. He asked whether there were any new environmental designs for hospitals. In response, Mr. Raymond Wong said that with the help of the universities, HA had conducted surveys on the indoor air quality of hospitals and there were no major problems. In addition, HA planned to increase the frequency of air exchange in hospital wards from 6 up to 12-14 exchanges per day. On building designs, HA would provide a lot of input at the design stage and incorporate environmentally friendly facilities into hospital premises. Another Member agreed that indoor air quality was very important and suggested conducting a general investigation on indoor air quality of all hospital premises to see if they were in compliance with EPD's air quality standards. A Member added that renovation in hospitals could contaminate indoor air, and suggested setting up environmental audits to monitor the environmental impact of hospital renovation projects.

26. In response to the Chairman's question on the support required by HA to achieve waste reduction and other environmental goals, Dr. K M Choy said that HA hoped to be able to use more LPG vehicles and step up recycling initiatives such as the recycling of glass bottles. Other HA initiatives included the motivation of staff to support environmental measures and he hoped that green groups could work with them on that aspect.

27. In reply to the Chairman's enquiry, Dr. Choy said that the

operating cost of LPG vehicles was higher in comparison with diesel vehicles due to the high maintenance cost. Also, there were few LPG filling stations in their patient catchment areas. Mr. Thomas Chow said that motor LPG cost about \$2 per litre while motor diesel cost about \$11 per litre. He was not sure about the basis showing that the operating cost of LPG vehicles was higher. As regards staff motivation, a Member said that green groups would be happy to help HA to organize programmes such as “green angel scheme” to motivate hospital staff.

28. Finally, a Member referred to hospital renovations and suggested HA to set up an information network among hospitals so that the furniture and equipment to be disposed by one hospital could be re-used by others.

29. The Chairman thanked the presentation team for sharing experience with the Council and he appreciated the achievements of HA in environmental management.

Agenda Item 5 : Report of the Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee

(ACE Paper 28/2003)

30. Members endorsed the EIA report with the condition set out in paragraph 7 of the Subcommittee report.

Agenda Item 6 : Management of Construction and Demolition Materials
(ACE Paper 30/2003)

31. The Chairman welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. Ms. Annie Choi briefed Members on the latest progress of the management of construction and demolition (C&D) materials.

32. A Member supported the strategies in the paper in dealing with C&D materials. He asked whether there was any plan to release the temporary fill banks for long-term development. In response, Ms. Annie Choi confirmed that the two temporary fill banks had other designated uses at around 2007-08 and it was necessary to find an outlet for the C&D materials stockpiled there.

33. In response to the Chairman’s enquiry on the source of the soft inert materials, Ms. Annie Choi said that both building and civil works would generate soft inert materials. For building projects, the site formation works could also generate large volumes of soft inert materials.

34. Two Members estimated that the amount of C&D materials

would drop in view of the decreased number of new residential buildings. In response, Ms. Annie Choi said that even with such a decrease, the volume of C&D materials that would be generated would still be substantial. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms. Annie Choi said that Government and the private sector each generated about 50% of the C&D materials.

35. The Chairman enquired whether the implementation of the landfill charging scheme was on schedule. In response, Ms. Annie Choi said that the Administration aimed to submit a Bill on the proposed landfill charging scheme to the Legislative Council before the end of the year. The preparation work was on schedule.

36. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Ms. Annie Choi clarified that the Administration planned to use soft inert materials to replace dredged mud in the capping layer of the mud pits in East Sha Chau. A Member asked whether there were any control measures to make sure that the soft inert materials were fit for the capping layer. In response, Ms. Choi said that the Bureau would work closely with CED and EPD on the monitoring procedures, and there would be very stringent control and monitoring. For instance, a reception site would be set up at Kai Tak, and there would be inspection on each truckload of materials.

37. A Member suggested exporting C&D materials to South East Asian countries for reclamation purpose. Another Member said that Macao might need C&D materials for their reclamation projects. In response, Ms. Annie Choi said that the cost of transporting C&D materials to South East Asian countries would be quite substantial. As regards Macao, the Administration had informally sounded out the relevant departments of the Macao Special Administration Region Government but was advised that such were not required. Ms. Choi then informed Members that during the expression of interest exercise conducted last year, some companies did come up with projects in the Mainland that could take in C&D materials. However, none of those companies were able to provide related EIA reports and approval documents. The Administration therefore needed to discuss the matter with the Mainland authorities.

38. A Member remarked that the use of C&D materials to backfill quarries was a possible solution but there should be greening exercise at the quarries to improve their visual impact. C&D materials could also be used for quarries in the Pearl River Delta. In response, Ms. Annie Choi said that the Administration was exploring the suggestion seriously but the issue was not straightforward because some quarries in Hong Kong were still in operation and others already had designated uses. The Provisional Construction Industry Coordination Board had also raised the suggestion of using C&D materials to backfill quarries in the Mainland. The

Administration would explore that with the relevant authorities.

39. A Member commented that the population and immigration policies were the fundamental considerations for achieving sustainable management of solid waste. In response, Ms. Annie Choi said that the Administration was very concerned about the problem of C&D materials and the Bureau had been working closely with other Bureaux and departments, including the Sustainable Development Unit, to tackle the problem.

40. In response to a Member's enquiry on producers' responsibility, Ms. Annie Choi pointed out that for C&D materials, the landfill charging scheme was actually a form of producers' responsibility since the waste producers were required to pay for the disposal cost. She anticipated that with the implementation of the landfill charging scheme, the amount of C&D materials generated would be smaller.

41. A Member asked whether the closed landfills could be used for stockpiling C&D materials. In reply, Ms. Annie Choi said that there were 13 closed landfills and 12 of them had been restored and were undergoing environmental monitoring. Stockpiling C&D materials on them would disturb the monitoring work. In addition, the landfills were very small and their capacity could only handle very small amount of C&D materials.

42. In response to the Chairman's question on assistance that could be provided by the Council, Ms. Annie Choi said that the Bureau would report the progress in implementing the measures to the Council regularly and whenever there were new initiatives, and hoped that the Council would continue to provide support and helpful suggestions.

43. The Chairman concluded that the Council supported the proposed measures to tackle the C&D materials problems. He thanked the presentation team and looked forward to further reports on C&D materials in future.

Agenda Item 7 : Central Reclamation Phase III ***(ACE Paper 31/2003)***

44. The Chairman welcomed the presentation team to the meeting. Dr. Sarah Liao introduced the background of the project and Mr. T Y Cheung presented the details of the project to Members.

45. A Member supported the project and said that it should go ahead without delay because it was approved several years ago and contract had already been signed. Objections to the project, if any, should have been

raised during the consultation period. Another pointed out that the project had gone through a number of consultations and it was against normal procedure to have yet another round of consultation at the present stage. Three Members agreed that the Council should maintain its stance on the EIA report of the project unless the size of the reclamation area had increased. Mr. T Y Cheung confirmed that no such change had been made after the EIA report of the project had been approved.

46. A Member said that the Government should provide more comprehensive information to the public so that they could better appreciate the benefits of the project. Another Member said that the Government should tell the public clearly that apart from building the Central-Wanchai Bypass, another objective of the project was to return the Harbour to the public by facilitating access to the waterfront. He added that one of the reasons that the Harbour area looked smaller than before was that more high-rise buildings had been built along the coastline and much of the harbour view was blocked. The Government should clarify that protecting the Harbour was not equivalent to stopping all reclamation which in fact could bring positive impacts to the environment by reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality. A Member suggested controlling the height of new buildings to be constructed in the waterfront area.

47. Three Members said that the Government should consider making an undertaking to the public that the project would be the last reclamation project in Central. However, another Member said that circumstances might change in the future and it would be inappropriate for the Government to make guarantee in that manner. A Member remarked that the Government should clarify the environmental benefits of the project and the need for it, particularly in the long term. The Government should also justify to the public that the proposed reclamation size was the minimum required and that other alternatives were not as good as the present proposal. In addition, the Government should consider long-term measures to resolve traffic problems in Central.

48. A Member said that if the Central-Wanchai Bypass were justified, the proposed reclamation size would represent the minimum reclamation required. However, he considered it unwise to ignore the public views given the strong sentiments expressed. The Government should discuss with parties concerned to achieve a consensus as far as possible. Another Member said that in 1998 the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (HKIE) endorsed the proposed reclamation area of 23 ha and that position remained unchanged. Mr. John Chai informed Members that HKIE conducted a forum last Friday during which TDD presented to them the latest scheme of the project. The HKIE considered that the proposed scheme was reasonable and the area was the minimum required.

49. A Member said that to relieve public concerns, the Administration should provide the community with assurances by devising a package of short and long-term measures to deal with traffic problems in Central: setting up a Harbour Authority to manage the Harbour, the waterfront and coastlines; formulating a shoreline policy; appointing an expert panel to monitor the process of the reclamation work; and entrusting the management of the land in the waterfront to a Land Trust with a guarantee that the land would not be put up for sale. She said that the issue reflected the lack of trust in the Government. The appointment of experts and officials nominated by the management of other harbour authorities to form an expert panel for re-examining the project might regain the trust of Hong Kong people.

50. Two Members pointed out that while the Administration could control the usage of the reclaimed land and its density, it played very little role in the implementation of individual building projects which would unavoidably affect the visual quality of the Harbour and the waterfront. The Central Reclamation Phase I project was a typical example of the lack of control on the overall visual and landscape impacts of the project as a whole. The Administration should ensure close monitoring on the landscaping work of the waterfront.

51. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the impact assessment of the water quality, Mr. Benny Wong said that the assessment had taken all relevant factors into account such as effluent discharge, the dredging and dumping of contaminated and uncontaminated mud. The assessment indicated that there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on the water quality of the Harbour.

52. In response to Members' enquiry on whether the proposed reclamation was the last one in Central, Mr. John Chai said that the Secretary for Housing, Planning and Land had indicated several times in public recently that other than the Central and Wanchai reclamation and the reclamation in Southeast Kowloon development, there would be no further reclamation within the Harbour.

53. A Member asked whether traffic management measures such as the road charging scheme could help resolve traffic congestions in Central and hence doing away with the need for the Central-Wanchai Bypass. In response, Mr. Paul Tang clarified that the road would still be required because any road charging scheme would only control the number of vehicles going to Central whereas the main function of the Central-Wanchai Bypass would be to provide a direct link between Wanchai and the western part of Hong Kong without going through Central.

54. The Chairman thanked the presentation team. He said that since the reclamation area of the project had not increased, the Council's endorsement of the EIA report of the project remained unchanged. The Government should explain to the public the reasons for undertaking the reclamation at its current size, the benefits of the project and measures facilitating the public to enjoy the Harbour. In addition, the Government should consider the long-term measures to resolve traffic congestions in Central.

Agenda Item 8 : Any Other Business

Dinner in November

55. Members agreed to organize a dinner immediately after the November Council meeting, and invite former Members to join the dinner.

Visit to the Environmental Protection Bureau of the Guangdong Province on 31 October 2003

56. The Chairman reported that the visit to the Environmental Protection Bureau of the Guangdong Province would be held on 31 October 2003, and the Secretariat would soon issue a circular. Four Members agreed to join the visit. On transportation arrangements, Members agreed that they would take the first through train scheduled at 7:30 am. on 31 October.

Tentative items for discussion at the next meeting

57. The Chairman informed the meeting that the Third Comprehensive Transport Study and total water management were tentatively scheduled for the next meeting.

Agenda Item 9 : Date of Next Meeting

58. The next meeting would be held on 10 November 2003.

**ACE Secretariat
October 2003**