

Environmental Protection
Department

**Agreement No.
CE57/2006 (EP) Review
of the Air Quality
Objectives and
Development of a Long
Term Air Quality
Strategy for Hong Kong
- Feasibility Study**

Appendix B

Summary of Public
Engagement Findings

ARUP

B1 Summary of Public Engagement Findings

Area	Public Opinions
Air Quality Management Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to EPD and Environment Bureau, an inter-departmental authority should be established to oversee the air quality strategy. • Other government departments (e.g. Transport Department and Planning Department) should be present in the consultation to indicate their awareness of responsibility in this area. • There is a strong need for actions, determination and visions for improving our air quality in Hong Kong. • There is a need for development of an integrated air quality management framework. • A framework should be established to allow for a scheduled review system on both technology and strategies. • Health issues should be kept right at the forefront. The framework should include a system of clear accountability. • Collaboration with PRD region is necessary • It is necessary to consider the cost and benefit for the control strategies.
Air Quality Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need for a clear and health based Air Quality Objectives. • Inclusion of PM_{2.5} in the revised Air Quality Objectives. • Concerns have been raised on whether the new AQO should be related to technological and economic feasibility. • To balance health risks, technological feasibility, economic considerations and various other political and social factors, interim target is acceptable. • The ultimate air quality guidelines should not be related to cost or technological concern. Health should be a key consideration. • Greenhouse gas should be included into the air quality objectives
Timeline for Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AQO revision is an urgent task. • It was not clear how the Government was extrapolating with confidence that the committed emission reductions would lead to achievement of the current AQO by year 2010. • Even if the current AQO is achieved by year 2010, it should be noted that most of the measured health impact on the population is occurring at levels well below the current AQO. • If one tries to reach the goal in a hurry, choices are much more limited and the impact that one would suffer is much greater. Lead time is necessary in order to take advantage of opportunities. Careful planning is needed in developing the AQO interim timetable.
Implementation Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite the time requirement for technology to be developed and infrastructures and buildings to be renewed, there are measures (such as marine fuel control) that warrant immediate action and do not need to wait for the completion of the consultancy. • Instead of talking about half a century away, a new, hugely effective defining moment for Hong Kong, which could be emission control for marine, cross-boundary traffic control, flue gas desulphurization, etc. is required. • Small and medium enterprises should be involved to formulate comprehensive control strategies. The resources of small and medium enterprises to reduce emission are limited. • Target on street canyon effect to reduce the impact of vehicular emission. • There is no firm schedule for the proposed near term, medium term and long

Area	Public Opinions
	term control strategies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed control measures are conceptual. There are no implementation details.
Implications on the EIAO Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing EIA process may need to be reviewed as a result of introduction of the new AQO because planned projects now use the current AQO to assess their future emissions, by then the AQO might have been changed. • If the future EIA projects are assessed against the WHO ultimate objectives, it might not be able to build any new roads as they might fail to pass the EIA process. • AQO is an objective but not a standard. It should be considered whether there should be a separate air quality criteria for EIA. • If the purpose of EIA is to protect the environment including human health, the criteria or objective to be used should be a measure of the impacts on the health of the environment and the people being affected. Developments have to suit the health of the environment, the human and whatever fauna and flora.
Education and Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current AQO is related to API. The current reporting system is miscommunicating the risk. It should be considered in the next stage of the study whether API should be decoupled from AQO and how to communicate risk associated with air pollution. • While the new AQO will be implemented in a gradual manner, the correct health impact descriptor must be retained. One must tell the general public actually what is happening to their health. • Education is necessary to let the public understand their responsibility.
Control Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase ratio of natural gas, clean coal technology and nuclear energy should be adopted for local electricity generation. • Demand side management is important to improve the air quality. • Building Energy Codes should be followed to increase energy efficiency. • Bus routes should be rationalized to reduce duplicated bus trips. • More cycling tracks should be built to improve the air quality. • Car free zone / pedestrianisation scheme should be extended to more areas.