

**Confirmed Minutes of the 118th Meeting of
the Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee
held on 5 December 2011 at 2:00 pm**

Present:

Mr TSANG Kam-lam, JP (Chairman)
Prof CHAU Kwai-cheong, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Ms Teresa AU
Dr Dorothy CHAN, BBS
Prof FUNG Tung
Mr Edwin LAU, MH
Prof Joseph LEE
Prof LI Xiang-dong
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Dr MAN Chi-sum, JP
Mr Simon WONG, JP
Dr YAU Wing-kwong
Dr Ray Yep
Miss Evelyn Leung (Secretary)

Absent with Apologies:

Ms Betty HO
Miss Yolanda NG

In Attendance:

Mr C W TSE, JP	Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Mr C C LAY	Assistant Director (Conservation), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)
Ms Joanne Chin	Executive Officer (CBD), EPD
Ms Daicie Tong	Executive Manager (CBD), EPD

In Attendance for Agenda Item 2:

Mr Elvis AU, JP	Assistant Director (Nature Conservation & Infrastructure Planning), EPD
Mr Joseph SHAM	Assistant Director (Country and Marine Parks), AFCD

Mr P H LUI	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Infrastructure Planning)
Mr H M WONG	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment), EPD
Mr. T K CHENG	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Infrastructure Planning)1, EPD
Mr Lawrence NGO	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment)2, EPD
Mr Dick CHOI	Senior Marine Conservation Officer/West, AFCD
Ms K Y YANG	Senior Conservation Officer/South, AFCD
Mr Freeman CHEUNG	EIA Study Team Leader, AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM)
Mr David Lui	Project Manager, AECOM
Mr Peter LEE	Air Quality Specialist, AECOM
Ms Echo LEONG	Deputy Project Manager, AECOM
Ms Francis LEUNG	Ecology Specialist, AECOM
Ms Amy CHEUNG	Water Quality Specialist, AECOM
Mr Steven WONG	Noise Specialist, AECOM

Action

Agenda Item 1 : Matters arising

The Chairman informed Members that the draft minutes of the 117th meeting held on 18 April 2011 had been circulated to Members in June 2011. Members had confirmed the draft minutes by circulation. The confirmed minutes have been posted on the Council website. There were no matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting.

Agenda Item 2 : EIA report on “Development of Integrated Waste Management Facilities Phase 1”
(ACE-EIA Paper 6/2011)

Internal Discussion Session

2. The Chairman informed Members that agenda item 2 would be divided into the following four sessions –

- (a) Internal Discussion Session
- (b) Presentation Session
- (c) Question-and-Answer Session
- (d) Internal Discussion Session

The Presentation Session and Question-and-Answer Session under agenda item 2 would be opened to the public. Internal Discussion Sessions of agenda item 2 and all other sessions of the meeting would remain closed.

3. The Chairman informed Members that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report on “Development of Integrated Waste Management Facilities Phase 1” (IWWMF) was a designated project under “Schedule 2” of the EIA Ordinance (EIAO). The public inspection period of the report was opened from 18 November 2011 to 17 December 2011. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had received 110 sets of public comments while nine submissions been addressed to or copied to the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE) or the Subcommittee before the meeting. These public comments and submissions, as well as the project proponent’s response to a Member’s question had been circulated before the meeting or tabled at the meeting for Members’ information. Since the public inspection was still open until 17 December, EPD would provide any further public comments received to the ACE for information.

4. The Chairman informed Members that a Member had declared interest before the meeting that her company was involved in a consultancy service for the public engagement exercise related to the development of the IWWMF. To avoid any potential conflict of interest, the Member had asked to be excused from the meeting.

5. The Chairman reminded Members to keep confidentiality of the discussion on the EIA report until the full Council had made the final decision on the conditions and recommendations to the EIA report. While Members could express their personal views in their own capacity, they were reminded not to quote the views of other Members nor the decision made by the Subcommittee during the meeting. Members were also advised to refer any enquiries to the Secretariat for follow-up in case they were approached on the discussion and/or decision of the Subcommittee.

6. The Chairman recapped that the IWWMF EIA report was first submitted on 17 January 2011 for approval under the EIAO and was exhibited for public inspection from 17 February 2011 to 18 March 2011. The Subcommittee discussed the EIA report on 21 March 2011 and recommended to the ACE that the report be approved with conditions. The ACE subsequently discussed and endorsed the EIA report with conditions on 11 April 2011.

7. In view of the complications relating to the Court of First Instance’s judgment for the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) EIA, the EIA report was withdrawn on 11 May 2011. With the judgment of the HZMB EIA handed down by the Court of Appeal on 27 September 2011, the project proponent re-submitted the EIA report on 24 October 2011 under the EIAO with minor updating and modifications.

8. The Chairman noted that the EIA report included the assessment of

three scenarios based on two potential sites for the development of the IWMF, namely Middle Tsang Tsui Ash Lagoon (TTAL) in Tuen Mun and an artificial island near Shek Kwu Chau (SKC), without making recommendation on a preferred site.

9. Members agreed that since the Subcommittee already had a long and detailed discussion of the EIA report in March 2011 and given its views to the ACE, the present discussion should focus on the key changes made in the report. The meeting agreed that the project proponent should be invited to provide clarifications on the following broad categories, namely visual and landscape impacts at SKC, site selection, choice of technology, logistics arrangements and air quality monitoring.

[The project proponent team joined the meeting at this juncture.]

Presentation Session (Open Session)

10. Mr Elvis Au briefed Members on the background of the project and Mr Freeman Cheung briefed Members on the updates and modifications to the EIA report.

Question-and-Answer Session (Open Session)

Visual and landscape impacts at SKC site

11. A Member said that according to the judgment on the HZMB project, the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) had the obligation to endeavour reducing the impacts which a project would bring about to the environment to the minimum. He considered that the design of the proposed incinerator offshore SKC, including the reclamation and breakwater, as well as the building plant and chimney, could not blend in with the natural environment of SKC as suggested by the project proponent. He considered that there were still rooms for further reducing the visual impacts of the project.

12. Mr Elvis Au replied that the two proposed sites now under consideration were selected from a comprehensive site search exercise carried out in 2007/8. The site search exercise covered the whole of Hong Kong and in accordance with the advice of the Advisory Group on Waste Management Facilities, 23 types of areas such as the ecologically sensitive areas were excluded. The two proposed sites which were selected from an initial list of 21 sites were not within any ecologically sensitive areas such as existing or proposed marine parks or reserves. Under the EIA study, a detailed visual impact assessment had been carried out and the present design meeting the basic minimum requirements of the project was proposed. The community would be engaged later with regard to the design theme and outlook of the facilities. The Government would specify in the Design-Build-and-Operate (DBO) contract that the facilities would be designed to be visually pleasing and be acceptable to the local community. In fact, the artificial

island near SKC at which the IW MF was to be built would be separated from the SKC by a water channel, thereby conserving the natural shoreline and terrestrial ecology of the area. Mr Freeman Cheung added that a series of measures were recommended in the EIA study to minimize the visual impacts of the IW MF on the environment, which included using boulders of similar colour tone of the SKC rocky shore for the sea wall, designing green rooftop and vertical greening along the building façade, and slanting the cofferdam for compatible outlook with the natural rocky shore of the island. The outlook design of the IW MF would be further developed, taking on board the public comments received. He illustrated with pictures taken from different viewpoints towards SKC that the IW MF would not be very noticeable as it would blend in well with the surrounding landscape.

13. A Member enquired if a wavy/curvy design could be applied to the rooftop and breakwater of the facilities to give a harmonious view with the surrounding of SKC. Mr Elvis Au said that the Government was open to the idea and would engage the public on the design theme of the project. Mr David Lui added that what was presented in the EIA study was the basic design concept. The detailed design would be developed by the future contractor under the DBO contract. There was flexibility in the design so long as the project works area was within the limits gazetted under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance, Cap. 127 for the project. He further pointed out that one important consideration was to have the smallest scale of reclamation possible so as to minimize the impacts to the seabed and the natural marine habitats.

Site selection

14. A Member noted that the TTAL site was designated for industrial use while the SKC site was earmarked for leisure tourism and conservation. The proposed setup of the incinerator at SKC would upset the Government's original plan for the island. Besides, reclamation was required for the SKC site but not so for TTAL. Further, the visual impacts brought by the plant were much greater on SKC than in TTAL. He queried the Government's rationale for the preference of SKC over the TTAL option.

15. Mr Elvis Au explained that the EIA dimension was one of the many factors which the Government had to take into account when assessing the acceptability of the two proposed sites for the IW MF project. There were four key strategic considerations in site preference vis-à-vis the overall waste management policy. The artificial island near SKC was the preferred site for the first IW MF based on the following considerations –

- (a) A balanced spatial distribution of strategic waste treatment facilities in Hong Kong, including landfills, sludge treatment facilities, chemical waste treatment centres and refuse transfer stations (RTS). Three landfills were in operation in Tuen Mun, Tseung Kwan O and in northeast New Territories. There was a large-scale sludge treatment facility (i.e. a sludge incinerator with a design capacity of 2,000 tonnes per day) being built at the site next to

TTAL which would be operational by 2013. The chemical waste treatment centre was located in Tsing Yi and a new organic waste treatment facility located in Siu Ho Wan, Lantau. The artificial island near SKC was chosen given that it would enable a more balanced distribution of the various strategic waste management facilities in the territory.

- (b) The distance of transfer of waste from the RTS to the proposed IWWMF site. At present, there were two RTS on Hong Kong Island and one in west Kowloon. Three marine vessels were deployed to deliver sealed containers with waste from these RTS to the landfills. The artificial island site near SKC was chosen in view of the savings in marine transport distance for refuse from the three existing refuse transfer stations by about one-fourth as compared with the TTAL site. This could help reduce the impact and carbon dioxide emission.
- (c) Prevailing wind direction and major pollution sources. Wind direction in Hong Kong was predominantly from northeast to southwest. Emission from the proposed IWWMF at the artificial island site would be blown over the sea in the southwestern part most of the time. Given this meteorological phenomenon and that there were much less air pollution sources near SKC than in TTAL, the cumulative air quality impact with the artificial island site would be lower.
- (d) Potential of economic synergy. The IWWMF project would include community and education facilities. This together with ferry service provision from Cheung Chau to the IWWMF near SKC would generate economic synergy potential with the neighbouring islands such as eco-tourism and leisure fishing.

16. A Member noted that it was estimated that the three landfills would be filled up by early to mid 2018, but that the construction of the IWWMF at the site near SKC would be completed only by 2018-2019, whereas that for the TTAL site would be by 2017. He enquired what measures the Government had in mind in handling the refuse generated during that one-year gap. Mr Elvis Au replied that as promulgated earlier this year, the Government had adopted a three-pronged approach on waste management, including enhancing measures on waste reduction and recycling; introducing modern waste treatment facilities and extending the landfills. Specifically the new initiatives such as the proposed extension of the plastic bag levy, the proposed Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) scheme, the coming consultation on the proposed waste charging scheme, the setting up of community recycling networks, the Environment and Conservation Fund (ECF) scheme for food waste reduction and recycling in private housing estates, and the development of organic waste treatment facilities, etc. would all help extend the operational lifespan of the landfills.

17. Another Member noted that the food waste treatment plant in Siu Ho Wan, Lantau could only handle 200 tonnes of waste per day while the food waste

generated in Hong Kong were some 3 000 tonnes per day. He enquired about the estimation of the total volume of food waste that could be reduced/recycled by the proposed measures vis-à-vis the pressure to be released from the landfills. He also urged the Government to spearhead measures on waste reduction and recycling and not to plan for building another incinerator following the proposed IWWMF. He further pointed out that there was already an existing site in Tuen Mun for cement production which could be developed as a eco-co-combustion plant as an alternative for waste treatment with even higher processing capacity and lower setup and running costs than the proposed incinerator at SKC.

18. In response, Mr Elvis Au explained that with the support of the community, Hong Kong had achieved a waste recovery rate of 52%. The government would continue to vigorously promote waste reduction at source and waste recycling through behavioural change brought about by education, partnership with non-government organizations (NGOs) and various subsidy schemes. Regarding the Green Island Cement's proposed eco-co-combustion plant, it had actually been considered in the technology review carried out in 2009 under the IWWMF engineering study and was found to be not suitable for the first IWWMF. Mr David Lui added that a pilot plant trial of the proposed eco-co-combustion system for waste treatment had been launched by the private company for two months in 2005. The daily processing capacity was only a few tonnes and there was no further development to demonstrate the applicability of this technology. During their study for this project, they also found no sound examples of the eco-co-combustion system with similar installations in other countries. With no proven track record, they considered it too risky to adopt such technology for the IWWMF of the present scale.

19. A Member considered that the construction of an artificial island through reclamation would not minimize the impacts on the overall environment in SKC. Rather, it just shifted the impacts from the land habitats to the marine ecology. Mr Elvis Au explained that during the site selection process, all existing marine parks and the potential sites for marine parks with important conservation status had been excluded. The proposed artificial island would lie in a stretch of water which was not an existing/proposed marine park/reserve. The selection of IWWMF site had avoided the area around Soko Islands which was the only marine habitat in Hong Kong with frequent sighting of both Finless Porpoise and Chinese White Dolphins. He also pointed out that Finless Porpoise had a very wide activity range outside the SKC area. Besides, the IWWMF design had taken measures to minimize the potential environmental impacts of the project, for example the size of reclamation had been reduced by 40% by using vertical cofferdam whereas dredging volume had been reduced by over 2 million m³ through the choice of better dredging method. These would significantly reduce the impact on the habitat of Finless Porpoise and have only minimal impact on the marine ecology nearby.

Choice of technology

20. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr Elvis Au confirmed that

the technology used for the plant was the best available technology with proven track records.

21. A Member enquired about the plasma gasification technology which, according to some public comments, was the latest technology that some European countries were using and would entail a shorter construction time and at a lower cost. Ms Echo Leong explained that the plasma gasification technology was not considered because it was mainly used for treating industrial waste or hazardous waste on a small scale and had only limited applications for treating municipal solid waste (MSW). The technology had been reviewed in 2009 and the assessment results remained that it was not suitable for the IWMF. The moving grate incineration technology was recommended as the core technology for the IWMF in view of its well-proven effectiveness in terms of processing capacity and reliability.

(An email reply from the project proponent in response to a suggestion from a member of the public on the use of plasma gasification technology was tabled for Members' reference. The reply included the project proponent's findings regarding the plasma gasification technology.)

22. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Elvis Au confirmed that the present technology was the best one as advised by an advisory group comprising representatives from different green groups, professionals and academics. The advisory group reviewed waste treatment technologies submissions by local and overseas companies and concluded in 2005 that incineration technology be recommended as the core technology for the proposed IWMF. The Administration commissioned the consultant for the IWMF engineering and EIA studies and also conducted a review on different technologies and presented the findings to the ACE in 2009 which came to the same conclusion.

23. In response to a further enquiry from the Member, Ms Echo Leong said that they had discussed with the major suppliers and experts overseas during the review. She noted that Tetronics UK had a number of installations for hazardous waste treatment and but just one plant for treatment of MSW together with refuse-derived-fuel and biomass waste.

Logistics arrangements for the IWMF plant to be set up in the SKC site

24. In response to a Member's enquiry about the volume of vessel traffic transferring MSW to the IWMF and its impact on the Finless Porpoises, Mr P H Lui replied that there were altogether only three return trips for MSW transportation vessels daily. Besides, the vessels would be required to slow down when they came close to the sites where Finless Porpoises were frequently spotted, hence the impact on Finless Porpoise due to marine traffic should be relatively small. In response to the Member's further enquiry on how the construction and operation of the incineration plant would affect fish yield as well as the Administration's fisheries enhancement measures, Mr Freeman Cheung explained that the affected area near SKC was of relatively low production yield with about 100-200 kilograms per

hectare, and the area of 31 hectares affected by the proposed reclamation would be relatively insignificant as compared to the overall fishing ground in Hong Kong. The impact on fisheries should correspondingly be small. As regards the enhancement measures, the Government had proposed to designate a 700-hectare marine park to the east of Soko Islands, and to implement measures such as release of fish fry and deployment of artificial reefs in the area to enhance marine ecology including fish yield in and around the proposed marine park. The Administration would seek to complete the designation of the marine park before the commissioning of the IWMF facilities at the artificial site near SKC.

25. The Chairman said that some public comments expressed concern that the marine park might deprive the fishermen of their area of operation and thereby would affect their livelihood. Mr Elvis Au said that the Administration would introduce well-proven enhancement measures to enhance fisheries resources in and around the marine park area. They would also adopt very stringent control measures during reclamation works to reduce the release of suspended solid to the marine environment which might affect fisheries.

26. A Member enquired about the time required for the marine park to take effect in restoring/enhancing fish yield and the progress of the fisheries enhancement programme, including the promotion of eco-tourism and recreational fishing, as recommended by the ACE in April 2011. Regarding the beneficial effects of fisheries enhancement measures, Mr Elvis Au said that it had been studied by AFCD before and the findings had been positive. With the funding application and submission to the Legislative Council already in the pipeline, he expected that the Administration would soon commission a study to determine the detailed requirements of the proposed marine park in parallel with the IWMF planning and design works. Regarding the promotion of eco-tourism, the Administration had stepped up its liaison with fishermen's associations on how the fishing industry might contribute to eco-tourism. Previous experience in Sai Kung had been encouraging. The Administration and AFCD had been working closely with the Tourism Board and fishermen's organizations in promoting the concept of eco-tourism and would make reference to the valuable experience gained with the opening of the Hong Kong Global Geopark of China (Geopark).

27. In reply to the question from a Member on the use of public fill materials for reclamation, Mr Freeman Cheung clarified that, comparing with the previous EIA report, the total volume of filling materials used for the reclamation remained basically the same, but that there would be more use of public fill whilst the release of suspended solid to the marine water during the reclamation process would be kept to a minimal level such that the impact on the nearby marine ecology would be environmentally acceptable.

Air quality monitoring

28. A Member enquired about the possibility of making dioxin monitoring a continuous rather than an intermittent process as currently proposed in

the report so as to address the public concern over the health risk posed by dioxin. Mr Freeman Cheung said that there was at present no well-recognized and reliable method for instantaneous monitoring of dioxin. Dioxin monitoring was normally performed in an intermittent manner by stack sampling of the exhaust from chimney and the sample would then be sent to the laboratory for analysis. Mr Peter Lee supplemented that the EIA proposal had followed the best practices in Hong Kong and the European Union that stipulated that the minimum requirements for intermittent monitoring was quarterly monitoring for the first 12 months and at half-yearly intervals thereafter. Mr Elvis Au said that the feasibility of increasing the frequency of monitoring could be reviewed having regard to other comparable facilities in Hong Kong.

29. In response to another Member's enquiry on the distribution of monitoring stations, Mr Peter Lee replied that an air monitoring station would be set up in Cheung Chau if the artificial island site near SKC was chosen. The same arrangement would be made in Tuen Mun should the TTAL site was selected. The comprehensive monitoring requirements would be developed at the detailed design stage.

30. Since Members had no further questions on the revised report, the Chairman thanked the project proponent for attending the meeting and sharing the new information with the Members.

[The project proponent team left the meeting at this juncture.]

Internal Discussion Session

31. A Member raised disagreement to developing the IWMP on the artificial island near SKC in view of the visual impacts of the development on the natural landscape of the island, in parallel with the permanent damage to the marine ecology and loss of marine habitats thereat.

32. Two Members enquired whether a baseline of dioxin level in or near Cheung Chau had been collected and set in the EIA report. The Chairman also asked if the Subcommittee could impose a condition on the EIA report to request the project proponent to conduct such measurement if it was not yet included in the report. Mr C W Tse pointed out that a baseline dioxin level had been provided in the EIA report. As the proposed incineration facilities were not yet in operation and there was no other major source of dioxin in Hong Kong, the baseline data in the report could reflect the current dioxin level in the territory. The location for collecting samples of dioxin level should depend on the actual location of the project. He supplemented that, as set out in the Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM&A) Manual, the project proponent was required to submit an air quality monitoring programme which should include measuring the baseline dioxin level before the project was to commence operation. The Chairman commented that the measurement of the ambient dioxin level should take place at the height of the chimney(s) of the incinerator rather than by any ground level air quality monitoring

station as was the general practice.

33. In response to the questions from two Members regarding the number of air quality monitoring station(s) to be set up in relation to the project, Mr C W Tse advised that a main function of the air quality monitoring station was to verify the results of the modeling assessment of the EIA. The location of the new air quality monitoring station should be determined according to the location of the incineration facility but from the technical perspective, it might not be necessary to set up multiple air quality monitoring stations within close proximity. He informed that there were already 14 functional air quality monitoring stations evenly distributed over the territory, the data so collected should be representative of the air quality (including dioxin level) nearby. There was also the cost effectiveness dimension which had to be taken into consideration for setting up new air quality monitoring station(s). The number and location of the air quality monitoring stations needed could be considered in the air quality monitoring programme to be submitted.

34. In answering the further enquiry from a Member on the air quality monitoring issue, Mr C W Tse advised that while it could be possible that the data collected by the monitoring stations would be slightly different when compared with the assessment results, it was unlikely that the discrepancy could be of significant magnitude as the model should have been fully calibrated. The Chairman suggested that the monitoring station(s) should be located in proximity to the populated and heavily visited areas so as to help dispel the worries and misconception of the community that the project would lead to the deterioration of the air quality and the environment nearby the incineration facilities.

35. A Member suggested that a condition or a recommendation should be included in the EIA report to propose an enhancement to the air quality monitoring system for both sites, including the air quality parameters and respective frequencies. In response, Mr C W Tse advised that if considered necessary, the Subcommittee might consider imposing that as a condition for endorsing the EIA report, or as a recommendation of the Subcommittee for EPD to follow up in the EM&A programme of the project. Members agreed that a clear requirement on air quality monitoring should be incorporated as an improved condition in the report.

36. A Member raised disagreement to the Government's efforts in implementing the IWMPF project and on its assessment on the need for further development of similar facilities and the way forward. The meeting agreed to refine the wordings of the relevant condition to reflect the concern.

37. In respect of the SKC site, a Member enquired on the proposed completion time for the marine park to be designated in the waters between SKC and Soko Islands. Mr Joseph Sham explained that, according to the condition set out in the last meeting, designation of the marine park would immediately follow the completion of the project construction works. It would take some 26 months to

complete the designation processes as required under the Marine Parks Ordinance, which included approval from the Executive Council and conduct of public consultations at various levels before putting the plan for consideration/endorsement by the Legislative Council. To better synchronize with the schedule of the IW MF project, which was expected to be functional by 2018-2019, the designation work should start in around 2015 the latest. Although it was preferable and appeared feasible to designate the marine park before the commissioning of the IW MF facilities at the SKC site, in order to allow flexibility for both programmes to proceed smoothly in parallel, the meeting agreed to make a recommendation to the EIA report that endeavours should be made to complete the designation of the marine park before the IW MF project became operational.

38. Taking on the strong sentiment of the fishing community in Cheung Chau, a Member suggested imposing a condition to formulate a fisheries enhancement programme rather than a recommendation as at present in order to address their concern. Mr C W Tse pointed out that part (b) of the recommendation of the last meeting in respect of the SKC site had two elements, namely to formulate a fisheries enhancement programme and to promote related activities such as eco-tourism and recreational fishing. While the project proponent could formulate a fisheries enhancement programme as requested, the implementation of eco-tourism and recreational fishing would depend on factors such as commercial viability and willingness of the fisherman groups, etc, which were beyond the control of the project proponent. Members agreed that the part on fisheries enhancement programme should be set as a condition for endorsement, and the latter element could be retained as a recommendation to the EIA report.

39. Another Member enquired about whether the fisheries enhancement programme had to be agreed by the fishermen groups. Mr C W Tse advised that the project proponent should endeavour to formulate the fisheries enhancement programme in consultation with AFCD, and wherever appropriate with dialogues and consultations with the fishing community. However, it might not be practicable to make agreement by fisherman groups a requirement. Mr Joseph Sham supplemented that AFCD must be satisfied with the enhancement programme before submitting it to DEP for approval. This had to be done before the commencement of the project construction works.

40. After discussion, the meeting agreed to recommend to the full Council that the EIA report could be endorsed with the following proposed conditions, and that the meeting also made the following proposed recommendations –

In respect of TTAL site

(I) Proposed conditions

- (a) The project proponent should submit a detailed proposal on enhancement of air quality monitoring in Tuen Mun District to the Director of

Environmental Protection (DEP) for approval before commencing the construction of the project. The proposal should include the setting up of air quality monitoring station(s) and devising air quality monitoring programme(s) to keep track of the air quality impacts of the project. The proposal should include the air monitoring parameters and their respective frequencies, and the results should be made known to the public;

- (b) The project proponent should submit a plan, in consultation with Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD), for the compensatory permanent pond habitat within the project site and the interim habitat enhancement work at the unoccupied Middle Lagoon on the southern side of the project site to DEP for approval before commencing the construction of the project;
- (c) The project proponent should include in the Environment Monitoring & Audit (EM&A) programme a monitoring mechanism on potential ash leakage from the ash lagoon; and
- (d) The project proponent should set up community liaison group(s) comprising representatives from the concerned and affected parties to facilitate communications, enquiries and complaints handlings on all environmental issues;

(II) Proposed recommendations

- (a) To put in place a Woodland Enhancement Plan for areas in the vicinity of the project site which are sparsely vegetated to achieve carbon off-setting;
- (b) To recycle and reuse bottom ash generated by the waste incineration process with a view to maximizing its beneficial use before disposal to the landfills;
- (c) To formulate plans on developing communal facilities, with considerations on the potential to promote local employment opportunities, by using the energy and electricity generated by the project gainfully; and
- (d) To build on the experience of the first phase of the IWMP and take into account the progress of the effectiveness of waste reduction measures in assessing the need for further development of similar facilities and the way forward.

In respect of SKC site

(I) Proposed conditions

- (a) The project proponent should submit a detailed proposal on enhancement

- of air quality monitoring in Cheung Chau to DEP for approval before commencing the construction of the project. The proposal should include the setting up of air quality monitoring station(s) and devising air quality monitoring programme(s) to keep track of the air quality impacts of the project. The proposal should include the air monitoring parameters and their respective frequencies, and the results collected should be made known to the public;
- (b) The project proponent should advance the preparation works for the designation of the marine park in the waters between SKC and Soko Islands, including a study on the details of the designation, consultation with stakeholders and incorporation of enhancement measures such as deploying artificial reefs and releasing fish fry, on the understanding that the designation of the marine park would immediately follow the completion of the project construction works;
 - (c) The project proponent should submit a fisheries enhancement programme, in consultation with AFCD, to enhance fisheries resources in the vicinity of the project area to DEP for approval before the commencement of the project construction works;
 - (d) The project proponent should submit a detailed monitoring programme, in consultation with AFCD, on Finless Porpoise during the construction and operational phases to DEP for approval before commencing the construction of the project;
 - (e) The project proponent should submit a detailed plan on the on-site wastewater treatment plant based on realistic assessment of various sources of sewage, including those generated from the sanitary facilities of the proposed Environmental Education Centre and potential surface runoff, to DEP for approval before commencing the construction of the project; and
 - (f) The project proponent should set up community liaison group(s) comprising representatives of concerned and affected parties, including the fishery sector, to facilitate communications, enquiries and complaints handling on all environmental issues.

(II) Proposed recommendations

- (a) To maximize the use of local public fills, including construction and demolition materials, for reclamation of the artificial land;
- (b) To formulate a programme with a view to promoting activities such as eco-tourism and recreational fishing;
- (c) To complete the designation of the marine park in the waters between

SKC and Soko Islands before the completion of the project construction works;

- (d) To recycle and reuse bottom ash generated by the waste incineration process with a view to maximizing its beneficial use before disposal to the landfills;
- (e) To formulate plans on developing communal facilities, with considerations on the potential to promote local employment opportunities, by using the energy and electricity generated by the project gainfully; and
- (f) To build on the experience of the first phase of the IWFMF and take into account the progress of the effectiveness of waste reduction measures in assessing the need for further development of similar facilities and the way forward.

41. The Subcommittee agreed that there was no need to invite the project proponent to attend the full Council meeting on the report.

Agenda Item 3: Monthly updates of applications under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance

42. Members noted the updates.

Agenda Item 4: Any other business

Proposed meeting schedule for 2012

43. The proposed meeting schedules of the Council for 2012, which had been circulated to Members, were endorsed.

Tentative items for discussion at the next meeting

44. The Chairman informed Members that the MTRC would submit four EIA reports on the "Shatin to Central Link" for deliberation by the Subcommittee sometime in mid December. Members would receive the reports and papers in due course and be invited to indicate whether the project proponent should be required to attend the meeting for presentation and clarification. The meeting on the EIA reports, if held, had been reserved on 9 January 2012.

Agenda Item 5: Date of next meeting

45. The Chairman informed Members that the meeting scheduled for 19 December 2011 was cancelled. The next meeting would be held on 9 January 2012.

**EIA Subcommittee Secretariat
December 2011**