

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:05 a.m. on 11.1.2016.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Professor S.C. Wong

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Dr C.P. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Dr W.K. Yau

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Assistant Director (Regional 3)
Lands Department
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr K.F. Tang

Chief Transport Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr K.C. Siu

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Director of Planning
Mr. K.K. Ling

Matters Arising

[Closed Meeting] [Confidential Item]

1. This item was recorded under confidential cover.

Presentation Session

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests for the representations and comments had been made in the morning sessions of the hearing on 14.12.2015 and 16.12.2015. No further declaration of interests had been received from Members since then. Members' declared interests were recorded in paragraphs 5 to 7 of the minutes on 14.12.2015 and paragraph 5 of the minutes on 16.12.2015.

3. The following representatives of the Government, representers, commenters or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Donna Y.P.Tam

District Planning Officer/Sai Kung &
Islands (DPO/SKIs)

Mr Richard Y.L. Siu Senior Town Planner/Islands (STP/Is)

Ms Helena Y.S. Pang Assistant Town Planner/Islands (3)
(ATP/Is3)

Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)

Miss Grace W.S. Kwok Principal Assistant Secretary (Airport
Expansion Project Coordination Office)
(PAS(AEPCO))

Mr Henry C.K. Chu Chief Assistant Secretary (Airport
Expansion Project Coordination Office)
(CAS(AEPCO))

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Isaac K.S. Lo Senior Engineer/Islands (SE/Islands)

Mr Gabriel K.Y. Lau Engineer/Islands 2 (E/Islands2)

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

Mr Louis P.L. Chan Principal Environmental Protection
Officer (Regional Assessment)
(PEPO(RA))

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Mr Dick K.C. Choi Senior Marine Conservation Officer
(West) (SMCO(W))

Marine Department (MD)

Mr Tony T.F. Li Senior Marine Officer/Planning &
Development (3) (SMO/P&D3)

Mr P. Zou Marine Officer/Planning &

C331 – 吳志強

Ms Loletta Lau Oi Yee]
Mr Yuen Man Fai]
Ms Lai Sau Chu]
Mr Poon Wing Lok]
Mr Tang Siu Wing]
Ms Maggie Leung] Representers and Commenters' representatives
Ms Michelle Leung]
Ms Leung Wai Fei]
Ms Bonnie Chan Pui Shan]
Mr Leung Kwok Choi]
Mr Wong Chi Ho]
Ms Lei Pek PK]
Mr Ha Hei Lok]
Mr Choi Kin Hung]
Ms Sylvia Lee Siu Fong]
(Park Island Owners' Committee)

R8 – 新民主同盟荃灣工作隊

Mr Tam Hoi Pong - Representer's representative

R9 – Lo Mei Wan

Mr Lun Chi Wai - Representer's representative

R11 – Ms Chan Chiu Lan

Ms Chan Chiu Lan - Representer

R399 – Lam Chiu Ying

C128 – 林超英

Mr Lam Chiu Ying - Representer and Commenter

C1 – Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK)

C122 – Lee Ping Kuen

Mr Wilson Fung]

Mr Tommy Leung] Commenters' representatives
Mr Peter Lee]
Ms Billie Leung]
(AAHK)

C10 – Cathay Pacific Services Limited

Mr Kelvin Ko - Commenter's representative

C11 – Hong Kong Airport Services Limited

Ms Kwok Chui Man Jodi - Commenter's representative

C12 – Cathay Pacific Airways Limited

Mr Tong Wai Pong James - Commenter's representative

C13 – Hong Kong Dragon Airlines Limited

Mr Alex Lau - Commenter's representative

C14 – Cathay Pacific Catering Services (H.K.) Limited

Mr Wong Man Kit Andy - Commenter's representative

C15 – Board of Airlines Representatives Hong Kong

Mr Wyn Li - Commenter's representative

C17 – 荃灣各界協會

Mr Chan Sai Kwong - Commenter's representative

C22 – Hong Kong Strategy

Ms Lam Wai Sham - Commenter's representative

C24 – Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance

Mr Ip Tat Yan - Commenter's representative

C42 – 工程界社促會

Mr Lee Ping Kuen - Commenter's representative

C135 – Mak Hei Man

Ms Mak Hei Man - Commenter

C155 – 周月翔

Ms Pong Yuen Yee - Commenter's representative

C329 – 吳家聰

Mr Wan Yu Ting - Commenter's representative

4. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing as follows:
- (a) due to the large number of representers/commenters indicating that they would attend the hearing, the hearing was scheduled to be held in 4 days, i.e. 14.12.2015 and 16.12.2015 for representers, and 11.1.2016 and 12.1.2016 for the remaining representers and commenters;
 - (b) for each hearing session, government's representatives would first brief Members on the background. Afterwards, the representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions in turn according to their numbers;
 - (c) as a large number of representers/commenters or their representatives had registered to make the oral submissions, the Board agreed on 16.10.2015 that each of them should be allotted 10 minutes for their oral submission;
 - (d) there was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives 2 minutes before the allotted time was to expire and when the allotted time limit was up; and
 - (e) question and answer (Q&A) sessions would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives at each hearing session

had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government representatives or representers/commenters or their representatives; and after the Q&A sessions, the hearing on that day would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives and the government representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing all the oral submissions from the representers/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in closed meeting, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

5. The Chairman then invited the representative of PlanD to brief Members on the representations and comments with respect to the Draft Chek Lap Kok Outline Zoning Plan (CLK OZP) No. S/I-CLK/13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Richard Y.L. Siu, STP/Is, PlanD, repeated the presentation that was made in the hearing session on 14.12.2015 and recorded in paragraph 36 of the minutes of 14.12.2015.

6. After the presentation by Mr Siu, the Chairman invited the representers, commenters or their representatives to elaborate on their representations and comments. As Ms Loletta Lau Oi Yee, Representer R15 and Commenter C211, indicated that she would join the Park Island Owners' Committee to make their oral submission, which would last for 160 minutes, with the agreement of Ms Lau, the Chairman invited R339 and C128 to make his presentation first.

R339 – Lam Chiu Ying

C128 –林超英

7. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lam Chiu Ying made the following main points:

- (a) as pointed out in his presentation in the hearing session held in December 2015, there were other ways to increase the competitiveness of the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA). There was no need to waste resources in building the three-runway system (3RS). As compared with the land

development value of some HK\$2,000 billion, the economic return of some HK\$1,000 billion of developing 3RS was insignificant. Taking Guangzhou Baiyun International Airport (GBIA) as an example, when its third runway opened in February 2015, there was only an increase in air traffic movements (ATMs) in the order of 10 per day due to airspace conflict with the Foshan Shadi Airport (FSA). As such, if the airspace issue with the Shenzhen Bao'an International Airport (SBIA) could not be resolved, it was impossible for HKIA to increase ATMs above the current level of 68 per hour even with 3RS;

- (b) as he had been involved in the planning of HKIA since 1979 in the capacity of a government official of the Hong Kong Observatory, he was very familiar with the development of the airport. Air traffic coming in and out from the south of Hong Kong had to pass through two air portals to the northeast and northwest of Lantau Island. Two more flight paths, with one known as the 'Tai Lam Chung' flight path, were also available for air traffic to the north of Hong Kong;
- (c) if HKIA was to operate under a dual-runway system (2RS) with segregation operation, i.e. one runway exclusively for approaches and the other exclusively for departures, the capacity was 52 ATMs per hour. If with dependent approaches and departures, the capacity was 69 ATMs per hour, and if with independent mixed mode, use of precision instrument and small-scale peak levelling works on Lantau Island, the capacity was 86 per hour;
- (d) the 'Tai Lam Chung' and the northern flight paths had not been used since the opening of HKIA because the paths were in conflict with those of SBIA. SBIA had made the greatest concession to cater for the air traffic of HKIA. It was almost impossible to set back further the airspace of SBIA to comply with the safety standards of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). The airspace issue was a technical issue that could not be resolved simply through negotiation with the Mainland authority;

- (e) there should be other measures to increase the capacity of the airport, such as by using more precision instrument and small-scale peak levelling works on Lantau Island so that air traffic could deviate from the centre-line to the south after departure earlier to allow an increase in ATMs. It was for some unknown reasons that those measures had not been pursued over the years;
- (f) hence, if the airspace issue could be resolved, 2RS in independent mixed mode could adequately cater for the future growth of air traffic without the need of building 3RS. On the other hand, if the airspace issue remained unresolved because of the unavailability of a technical solution, the construction of additional runways would not help meet the future demand. The situation was analogous to the construction of additional platforms in a station for a single-track railway. The frequency of service was restricted more by the external factor that there was only a single track for train movement rather than by the number of platforms;

[Professor Eddie C.M. Hui arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (g) since the opening of the third runway in GBIA could only increase a small number of ATMs, GBIA had abandoned plans to construct further runways. As an alternative, they were considering constructing another airport to avoid conflict with the airspace of FSA. Even though Guangzhou and Foshan were both under the same provincial government, the airspace issue could not be resolved successfully. The airspace issue of HKIA, which involved a number of airports of different administration, including SBIA, the Macau International Airport (MIA), the Zhuihai Jinwan Airport (ZJA) and the Huizhou Pingtan Airport (HPA), was much more complicated and difficult to be resolved. 3RS would also involve basic safety issue. If aircraft could not land due to various reasons and was forced to fly to the northwest in case of emergency, it would be in conflict with the airspace of SBIA constituting a safety hazard;
- (h) the purpose of the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap. 131) (the Ordinance)

was to prepare and approve draft plans for the lay-out of areas of Hong Kong as well as for the types of building suitable for erection therein and prepare and approve development permission area plans with a view to the promotion of the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community. The construction of 3RS did not conform with the purposes of the Ordinance in that (i) the construction was a waste of valuable resources for an unnecessary facility, contravening the general welfare of the community; (ii) the project proponent failed to provide scientific data and sound justifications to address the aviation safety concerns and hence constituting a potential hazard; and (iii) the geographical environment of HKIA had rendered the airspace issue of the airport with its counterpart in Shenzhen invincible; and

- (i) the Board was requested to reject the proposal and require the project proponent to resubmit the proposal with demonstrations to substantiate that the need for an additional runway was genuine, the aviation was safe and the site was suitable for construction of 3RS.

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left this session of the meeting at this point.]

8. The Chairman then invited Ms Loletta Lau Oi Yee, R15 and C211, and Park Island Owners' Committee, who was the representative of various representers and comments, for an aggregate oral submission of 160 minutes. Before the oral submission began, Mr Tam Hoi Pong, Tsuen Wan District Council Member and four residents of Park Island, including Mr Lun Chi Wai, Ms Michelle Leung and Ms Loletta Lau Oi Yee raised the following concerns or requests regarding the rules and procedures as well as general matters of the hearing arrangement:

- (a) whether there could be two Q&A sessions for the hearing, one in the morning and another in the afternoon to facilitate some residents of Park Island, who could not attend the afternoon session, to raise questions to the Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK) and other government representatives;

- (b) whether it was appropriate for AAHK to make oral submission in the hearing as time should be reserved for the public to present their views;
- (c) whether it was appropriate for the Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) (PSPL) as a government official to take up chairmanship of the Board;
- (d) the Civil Aviation Department (CAD) should provide copies of the 97-page document on airspace (known as the “Pearl River Delta Regional Air Traffic Management, Planning and Implementation Plan (Version 2.0)” (the 2007 Plan)) to justify the necessity of constructing 3RS; and
- (e) whether copies of the PowerPoint presentation by PlanD could be provided to the attending representers, commenters and their representatives for easy understanding of the presentation.

9. In response to (a) above, the Chairman said that the Q&A session was for Members to ask questions and for government representatives or representers/commenters or their representatives to answer. It was an established practice to put the Q&A session at the end when all presentations by the attending representers and commenters had been completed. The practice had been followed in the previous hearing sessions, and it was inappropriate to deviate from the practice in the current session. The attendees could decide whether to stay for the Q&A session. Regarding (b), the Chairman said that AAHK attended as a commenter in the current session and had the right to make oral submission to explain further what they had stated in their written submission. As for (c), the Chairman said that there was judicial precedent which recognized the involvement of official members in the Board was legally in order. With respect to (d), the Chairman said that government departments might decide what information should be provided to the Board for consideration, and the Board would decide whether the information provided was sufficient for the purpose. Representers, commenters or their representatives could express their views and explain why they considered the supporting information provided by government departments was inadequate. For request (e), the Chairman said that the information in the PowerPoint presentation of PlanD was extracted from the TPB Paper which had been distributed to representers and commenters before the meeting. The Secretary added that the Paper had

also been uploaded to the Board's website for public browsing. As there were spare copies of the Paper available, the Secretariat provided the representers, commenters or their representatives a copy of the Paper upon request.

10. The Chairman then invited Ms Loletta Lau Oi Yee and representatives of Park Island Owners' Committee to start their presentation.

R15 – Loletta Lau Oi Yee

R12042–梁美娟

C201 – Chung Mei Ling

C202 –李偉雄

C203 –鄭劍夫

C204 – Chan Ida

C205 – Michelle Keung

C206 – Tin Shui Wah

C207 – Cheng Wai Yin

C208 – Chan Tak Fung

C209 – Lam Wai Man

C210 – Lam Pei Li, Beelie

C211 –劉藹宜

C213 –陳少珊

C330 –李妙儀

C331 –吳志強

11. Ms Loletta Lau Oi Yee made the following main points:

- (a) she had lived in Park Island, Ma Wan for 15 years and had been woken up by noise of aircrafts at countless nights. In 2007, complaints had been filed to CAD and the Legislative Council. In response, CAD promised to engage consultants to review the flight paths and reduce the number of flights flying over Ma Wan such as by arranging an earlier deviation of departure flights from the centre-line before entering Ma Wan. CAD's recognition of flight paths over Ma Wan in 2007 was in contradiction to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of 3RS which stated that Ma Wan

was outside the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) 25 Contour and was not under any flight path. As what Mr Lam Chiu Ying had said, if there was small-scale peak levelling works on Lantau Island and early deviation of flights from the centre-line, the capacity of the present airport could cater for the future need and hence construction of 3RS was not necessary;

- (b) according to information provided by CAD, there were 5,913 departure flights between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. annually over Ma Wan representing an average of a flight in 30 minutes. The number was increased to 19,596 flights annually or a flight of every 9 minutes during the period when complaints on noise were lodged, and then further to a flight per 4.5 minutes or 105 flights each night in May 2015. Over half of the flights generated a noise level of higher than 65dB(A) and an average of 20.7 flights each night generated a noise level of over 79dB(A). For a normal person to stay under 127dB(A), he/she would be deafened temporarily. Under 90dB(A), it was like wood cutting by a chain saw, 80dB(A) like standing next to a highway, and 65 to 70 dB(A) like standing next to a street. Each night, the residents of Park Island were like sleeping at roadside and woken up by the loud noise of aircrafts;

[Some attendees at the meeting made some noise imitating the passage of a cargo plane flying over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

- (c) in the past 10 years, air traffic noise had caused tremendous nuisance to residents along Castle Peak Road in Sham Tseng, Tsing Lung Tau and Ma Wan. Under 3RS, night-time arrival flights would mainly pass along Castle Peak Road and departure flights over Ma Wan. 3RS would significantly increase the noise nuisance caused to the residents in the area. As compared to the current situation, air traffic noise would further affect people in Siu Lam, Tsuen Wan or even Tuen Mun. An example to illustrate the seriousness of aircraft noise on people's life was that a family had to move out of Park Island because the wife could not tolerate her husband of turning on air-conditioners in winter to avoid being woken up by aircraft noise at night;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a Boeing 747 flying over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

- (d) with the passage of flights, people had to increase the volume of televisions or were forced to miss the audio part of the broadcasting. Being a world class airport, HKIA should follow other international airports in imposing a heavier levy on night-time flights to, at least, remind airlines the nuisance they had caused to the residents;
- (e) 3RS at an estimated construction cost of about HK\$140 billion would be the most expensive single infrastructural project in Hong Kong, close to that of the Rose Garden Project, which comprised HKIA, Airport Railway, North Lantau Expressway, Route 3, Lantau Link (Tsing Ma Bridge, Kap Shui Mun Bridge), Land Reclamation in West Kowloon, Central Reclamation Phase I, West Kowloon Highway, Western Harbour Crossing and Phase I of North Lantau New Town at a cost of HK\$155.3 billion;
- (f) in 2014-2015, the turnover of HKIA was about HK\$16.3 billion. To deduct the return before tax of about HK\$9 billion, the return for the year was only about HK\$7.3 billion. Even if AAHK could secure a loan at a rate of 0.93 per annum, AAHK had to take 20 years for repayment. Since the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation only estimated an annual return of 3% for 3RS, the project was assessed as poor. Although some estimated that the return rate of the project could reach as high as 8% per annum, it had included the airport construction fee. If AAHK covered two-thirds of the construction cost by levying fees on customers and retaining operational surplus for project investments, the cost imposed on the customers would undermine the competitiveness of flights in HKIA with the budget flights offered by SBIA which could be easily accessed by bus at the Elements and services of the future Express Rail Link (XRL). The extra cost added to air tickets with 3RS in place might amount to half of the price of the budget airlines or the fare of XRL. Contrary to what AAHK had expected, 3RS might not increase the competitiveness of the airport;

- (g) currently, HKIA offered 7,300 employment opportunities. As estimated by AAHK, 3RS would increase direct employment by 14,100. It was unfathomable how 3RS alone could increase the number of employment that would double the current level of employment of the entire airport, and AAHK should be requested to explain how the figure was derived;
- (h) there were many infrastructural projects in recent years, e.g. the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB), the Shatin to Central Link, the South Island Line and the Liantang Boundary Control Point (LBCP) which had already caused shortage of labour and resources in the construction industry. 3RS would cause an increase in construction cost and further inflation leading to heavier burden on taxpayers. There was no financial reason for the Government to proceed with the project;
- (i) as commissioned by the Friends of the Earth and People's Aviation Watch, the Hong Kong Baptist University conducted a survey in March 2015. The findings showed that about 70% of people surveyed considered that 3RS should not be built when there was still spare capacity of HKIA and 60% considered that the construction should be withheld when the airspace issue had not yet been resolved; and

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a Cargo aircraft of the Mandarin Airlines over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

- (j) the residents of Park Island were seriously affected by aircraft noise each night, which was just like noise made by residents at the meeting. Residents of Park Island were tolerant and they would not make complaints without a cause. The high level and frequency of noise caused by passing aircrafts was a nuisance. Members were requested to make a fair and reasonable decision to turn down the 3RS proposal for the long-term benefit of Hong Kong. Following the western standard, long-term benefits should include both economic and social benefits. The welfare of residents should be given due respect. Members were invited to call a stop to this "White

Elephant” project.

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a Dragon Air aircraft over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

12. Mr Choi Kin Hung made the following main points:

- (a) AAHK provided unfounded information to residents of Park Island claiming that aircrafts would swerve to use the flight path above the Disneyland after completion of 3RS. However, it was common knowledge that aircrafts were forbidden to fly over the Disneyland;
- (b) it was unjustified to spend a huge sum of money to construct 3RS while there was no documentary proof that the airspace issue between HKIA and SBIA had been resolved. Government officials should ensure that public money was well spent. A decision on the 3RS should only be made after thorough deliberation;
- (c) the competitiveness of HKIA had dwindled. Many Mainlanders had started to use the mainland airports for airlines with newer aircrafts instead of coming over to Hong Kong for the older model aircrafts with higher airport levies. If the airport levies were to further rise with 3RS, more Mainlanders would be discouraged to come to use the airport services;
- (d) he lived in Park Island and personally experienced how the air traffic noise affected the residents of Park Island very early in the morning. Although double glazing and subsidies on air-conditioning fees were offered, the residents would never be adequately compensated for the loss of fresh air. People chose to live in Park Island because of the environment there. No people would like to live in an enclosed unit;
- (e) the construction of 3RS would increase the noise nuisance to Park Island due to the increase in frequency of flights. When survey on the construction of 3RS was conducted in 2013, the residents of Park Island

were not consulted as they were advised that Ma Wan was not going to be affected by 3RS and the survey concluded that no comment was received;

- (f) financial management in relation to the construction of airport had not been done properly. At the time when HKIA was under construction, the workers were overpaid. For labour that was short in supply, they were even paid four times higher than their normal wage. Cost overruns of the Government on public projects was not uncommon nowadays, coupled with economic recession, the construction cost of 3RS would likely exceed the estimated amount; and
- (g) AAHK had not provided substantive proof that 3RS was necessary and that the capacity of the airport was to exceed despite that more and more people chose to use the airports in the Mainland. Members were invited to consider carefully whether the proposal with insufficient justifications should be approved.

13. At this juncture, Mr Lun Chi Wai requested a hard copy of the PowerPoint presentation of PlanD. The Chairman said that to ensure smooth running of the hearing session, attendees should avoid interrupting the hearing. He advised Mr Lun to approach the Secretariat for assistance.

14. Mr Wong Chi Ho made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Park Island and had lived there since 2008. He enjoyed the fresh air, tranquillity and freedom of raising dogs in Park Island although transport was much more convenient in Mei Foo, the residential development he previously resided;
- (b) the transportation in Ma Wan needed to be improved. There was inadequate public transport services, particularly during public holidays. The bus service from Ma Wan to Tsuen Wan was always overcrowded. In response to residents' requests for better bus service, TD just replied that traffic condition and public transport services in Ma Wan were being

monitored, and feeder bus services to Mass Transit Railway stations were satisfactory. The introduction of an en-route stop at the Elements was not justified. Since the baseline adopted by TD in calculating the capacity of bus services was wrong, the conclusion made did not reflect the reality. The need of the residents had all along been neglected;

- (c) the air traffic noise problem in Park Island worsened over the years. There were overhead flights at two, four, five and six o'clock in the morning and the aircrafts passing over Ma Wan had also become more frequent. Although CAD said that aircrafts generating excessive noise were not allowed to operate in Hong Kong and those violating the standard would be penalized, CAD had never explained satisfactorily why the noise nuisance persisted and the details of penalty for violation of the noise standard;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of an aircraft over Ma Wan at 7:27 a.m. which produced a loud noise at this juncture.]

- (d) as he raised a dog at home, he had to turn on the air-conditioner 24 hours a day during the summer months. The impact of air traffic noise on him in summer was comparatively less significant. But in fall and winter, he would be woken up by air traffic noise at 4 o'clock in the morning. Referring to a chart showing the data collected by noise monitoring terminals of CAD at various districts shown on the visualizer, the noise impact of air traffic on Park Island was the most serious;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of an aircraft over Ma Wan at 7:37 a.m., which produced a loud noise, at this juncture.]

- (e) the EIA report prepared for the construction of 3RS had been approved. However, there was no condition requiring the provision of noise mitigation measures for Ma Wan as the island was not considered to be affected by noise generated by 3RS. The welfare of the Ma Wan residents had not been adequately protected; and

- (f) CAD had not treated the residents' complaints seriously. Although CAD claimed that noise mitigation measures had been implemented, no improvement was noticed. On the contrary, the noise problem of Ma Wan worsened each day. The only solution would be diverting the flight path from Ma Wan. 3RS would not be acceptable if the Government made no effort to level the peaks on Lantau Island and before the airspace issue with SBIA had been resolved. Members were invited to make wise decision which would look after the welfare of the residents.

15. Mr Yuen Man Fai made the following main points:

- (a) before moving to Ma Wan, he lived in Sham Tseng. While in Ma Wan, he first lived in Park Island and had currently moved to live in a village house;
- (b) he had to close the windows at night to avoid the air traffic noise. As he had access to the roof-top of his house, he and his daughter noticed that flights over Ma Wan were very frequent;
- (c) AAHK had never addressed the noise concerns of Ma Wan residents. The information available on AAHK's website was only related to how Hong Kong would be affected without 3RS. He was also surprised to learn that Ma Wan was outside the NEF25 Contour when the residents suffered seriously from the noise of air traffic each day;
- (d) the issues regarding airspace and XRL had to be resolved before 3RS should be considered. It was very common for flight delays in the Mainland due to air traffic regulation. The Government should secure assurance from the Mainland that future flights from HKIA would not be affected by the airspace issue;

[Dr W.K. Yau left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (e) it was easy to manipulate data to justify a proposal. The residents' concerns had not been addressed in the consultation exercise. Information

on AAHK or CAD's website was general and could not address the specific concerns of the residents. AAHK on the one hand encouraged the use of wide-bodied aircrafts and on the other hand opined that the aircraft mix at the airport was a commercial decision made by airlines. It showed that AAHK did not have proper control of matters relating to the airport;

- (f) it was claimed that priority would be given to restricting flights approaching Hong Kong from the south to reduce noise impacts and it was estimated that the target would be achieved in 2030. However, there were no details on how the estimation was derived. If AAHK could not even control the use of the type of aircrafts by airlines, he doubted whether they could effectively implement the said restriction;
- (g) the effect of XRL on the use of the airport should not be underestimated. With the introduction of XRL in the Mainland, people had begun to switch to use XRL instead of domestic flights to travel between cities. There were seldom delays in rail services and it took lesser time to get on a train;
- (h) it was also claimed that in the next twenty years, aircrafts meeting more stringent noise standards would be introduced in stages to further ameliorate the noise problem. Twenty years was a long time and there was no guarantee that what would happen then. Besides, the introduction of better aircrafts in the future should not be a valid consideration for deciding whether 3RS should be built;
- (i) AAHK did not have a good track record on credibility. They neither had good cost control nor followed proper procedures in development projects. How the works of AAHK could be monitored was therefore another issue that had to be tackled;
- (j) a new marine park was proposed to compensate for the harm caused to the ecology. It was a 'destroy first, compensation later' approach and might not be effective. Although it was proposed that advanced construction and reclamation methods would be used to minimize environmental impacts,

there was no guarantee that the methods would ultimately be employed;

- (k) relevant information to support the construction of 3RS or on issues, such as the airspace issue, should be made available on AAHK's website for general information. The information available was only on the economic benefits and employment opportunities brought about by 3RS;
- (l) the increase in number of imported workers for constructing 3RS and its associated impacts should be studied; and
- (m) Members were invited to consider the feeling of the local residents when they were woken up in the middle of the night by noise of aircrafts.

16. Ms Lai Sau Chu made the following main points:

- (a) she moved to live in Park Island during the period when Hong Kong was plagued by the severe acute respiratory syndrome. Because of the pleasant environment of the island, she had lived there for about 12.5 years;
- (b) she had once lived in Yau Yat Chuen near Kowloon City and needed to move out of the area because her then new-born son was disturbed seriously by the loud aircraft noise in the area. Park Island would soon follow the previous Kowloon City, with residents suffering from loud noise of the ever increasing flights;

[Mr Clarence W.C. Leung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (c) allowing flights passing over Ma Wan did not conform with the development concept of making Ma Wan an environmentally pleasing island where use of private cars was prohibited and the residents could enjoy fresh air;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of an aircraft over Ma Wan at 1:00 a.m. at this juncture.]

- (d) she owned two units in Park Island. Her children now requested her not to buy any more unit as residents would likely move out from Ma Wan should 3RS be constructed. The Government had not only neglected the transportation need of the residents but also the noise problem caused by passing flights over Ma Wan. The construction of 3RS was not justified given that there was still spare capacity of the airport;
- (e) although it was claimed that the issues regarding the airspace structure would be resolved by 2020, it meant that there were issues not yet resolved. There was no reason to approve 3RS when there was still outstanding issues;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of an aircraft over Ma Wan at midnight at this juncture.]

- (f) more and more people were using SBIA. The standard of the airport had been upgraded a lot over the years and it was more convenient for people in the northern part of the New Territories to use SBIA than going all the way to Chek Lap Kok for a flight to the Mainland. As pointed out by Mr Yuen Man Fai, XRL would definitely affect the demand of air transport; and

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of an old cargo aircraft over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

- (g) she was recuperating from cancer. Ma Wan's reputation of being an environmentally pleasing island with fresh air had been tarnished by air traffic noise. Members were requested not to neglect the request of the Ma Wan residents for a quality living environment when making a decision on the 3RS.

17. Regarding the noise made by some attendees while Ms Lai Sau Chu was making her presentation above, the Chairman noted that the rules laid down in the Guidance Note on Attending the Meeting should be observed and clamour, shouting and commotion were

prohibited.

[Upon the request of a Member, the meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes at this juncture.]

[Mr David Y.T. Lui and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left this session of the meeting during the break.]

18. Before the resumption of presentation by the Park Island Owners' Committee after the short break, a resident of Park Island, Mr Wan Yu Ting, said that although it had been set out in the Guidance Note on Attending the Meeting that clamour, shouting and commotion were prohibited, the imitations of noise caused by passing flights was intended to help Members understand the nuisance caused to residents in Ma Wan. He asked if they could continue imitating noise of passing aircrafts from time to time during their presentation. In response, the Chairman said that it was important to ensure that the meeting would be conducted in an orderly manner. The behaviour of representers and commenters should be reasonable and should not unnecessarily disrupt the presentation, particularly by the other representers/commenters. Ms Loletta Lau Oi Yee said that they had been very restrained and their expression had been confined to their own presentation.

19. Ms Lei Pek PK (李碧玉女士) made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Ma Wan and a tax-payer. Members were invited to make a decision, which would have a significant impact on Hong Kong's development and would involve use of huge resources, taking into account all relevant data and justifications;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a passenger aircraft over Ma Wan at 1:15 a.m. at this juncture.]

- (b) the residents of Park Island had played a skit before the meeting on G/F of the North Point Government Offices to illustrate the nuisance caused by passing aircrafts. Although Members might find the periodic imitations of aircraft noise during the meeting annoying, the annoyance was only

short-lived, but for the Ma Wan residents, so long as the airspace issue remained unresolved, aircrafts would have to fly to the south via Ma Wan causing noise nuisance to the residents. The residents would continue to be woken up every several minutes at night, particularly by cargo aircrafts. Other than water, food and a dwelling place, people also needed a good sleep at night. The request for a good sleep at night was reasonable and had been made to AAHK incessantly by the residents;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a passenger aircraft over Ma Wan at 12:18 a.m. at this juncture.]

- (c) AAHK did not give any substantive replies in the past consultation with the residents. Supporting documents were unavailable and the noise nuisance had become more serious over the years. The financial arrangements for 3RS were also unusual as approval of funding by the Finance Committee (FC) of the Legislative Council (LegCo) was not required. According to the proposed financial arrangements, the construction cost would ultimately and unfairly be shouldered by the Hong Kong citizens. Besides, why Ma Wan was excluded from EIA of 3RS was still unanswered;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a passenger aircraft over Ma Wan at 1:22 a.m. at this juncture.]

- (d) apart from the noise issue, 3RS would also affect the Chinese White Dolphins (CWD), which could not speak for themselves at the meeting. Although a marine park would be designated for CWD, the affected CWD might not survive the construction works. Ecological conservation should be a serious consideration of the proposal;
- (e) as there had already been many infrastructural projects taking place in Hong Kong and there was a shortage of labour and resources, the construction of 3RS would aggravate the situation. Cost overruns, like that of XRL, resulting from keen competition for resources would drive up construction cost and might even render the project unfinished;

- (f) if the airspace issue could be resolved, the capacity of HKIA could be increased without the need for the construction of 3RS and some HK\$100 billion could be saved. As the construction of 3RS would not bring about benefits to Ma Wan and to Hong Kong at large, there was no reason to consider the proposal; and

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of an old cargo aircraft over Ma Wan at 1:28 a.m. at this juncture.]

- (g) Members were requested to make a decision which would contribute to good use of money and land, and benefit the future generations. The money saved from the construction of 3RS could be better used for universal retirement protection. Members should also consider whether it was appropriate to approve the project when the crucial document on airspace issue had not been made available for public information.

20. Mr Tang Siu Wing made the following main points:

- (a) he lived in Park Island. He read out the following paragraph extracted from Green Sense's written submission, which had been attached to the TPB Paper:

“Owing to geographical constraints, the airports of Hong Kong, Macau and Guangzhou are located in close proximity to each other. The Mainland authorities have to implement an air traffic flow control over Hong Kong's civil aircrafts flying in the northern airspace of Hong Kong. Aircrafts departing from Hong Kong are required to climb to an altitude of 15 700 feet (commonly known as “air wall”) before entering the Mainland airspace, so as to ensure safety of aircraft movements at these airports. Under this restriction, aircrafts taking the northbound routes (such as flights to the Mainland or Europe) cannot head north immediately after taking off (as civil aircrafts cannot climb to an altitude of 15 700 feet within a short distance). Instead, they have to make detours in the Hong Kong airspace

to gain altitude over a longer distance. As a result of this “air wall” issue, the five northbound routes designed under the 1992 New Airport Master Plan (NAMP) cannot come into operation. It has thus significantly reduced the number of routes available for aircraft departures, rendering the airport of Hong Kong unable to achieve its originally designed capacity.”

- (b) the noise made by attendees imitating noise made by aircrafts in every seven to eight minutes was the real situation that Ma Wan residents experienced each day. The Chairman should have had some idea how residents felt by then;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a cargo aircraft over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

- (c) the noise problem of air traffic was very serious. Even the consultation session by AAHK at the Shell Plaza of Park Island had to be adjourned when there were passing aircrafts. AAHK said that the construction of 3RS was for the continual prosperity of Hong Kong and that Hong Kong’s economy would suffer if 3RS could not be constructed;
- (d) however, even before the construction of 3RS, he had already been tormented by the frequent passing of aircrafts. He began to develop depression symptoms. Although AAHK said that people should have known about the impacts of passing aircrafts when they moved in Park Island, they could not use the same excuse for 3RS. Residents had raised their objection to the proposal;
- (e) while fund would be reserved to compensate for the possible damage to the ecology but no compensation proposal had ever been made for the noise impact caused to the residents of Ma Wan;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a cargo aircraft over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

- (f) when he first moved into Ma Wan, he was fascinated by the romantic ambiance and picturesque scenery of Ma Wan. Counting aircrafts passing by at the beach had once been an exciting and favourable pastime for him and his wife. However, romance had been turned into melancholy and from melancholy to anger when the frequency of passing flights increased over the years. People at rooftop of the residential towers could even tell the name and model of the aircrafts because of the close distance of the flights;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a cargo aircraft over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

- (g) according to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Ordinance (Cap. 169), apart from neglecting supply to animals with sufficient food and sufficient fresh water, terrifying animals would also constitute an offence under the said Ordinance. His dog had died and he was now consulting his veterinary whether its death was caused by the loud noise of passing aircrafts for a possible litigation against AAHK;
- (h) the accident caused by a barge hitting the Kap Shui Mun Bridge had caused serious traffic chaos from the urban area to HKIA. Before improvement works to the transportation network and contingency plans were put in place, 3RS would only cause additional trouble should similar incident occur in future; and
- (i) as pointed out by Mr Lam Chiu Ying, town planning should promote the health, safety and general welfare of the community, and the Board was requested to consider 3RS taking into account these elements.

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of an aircraft over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

21. Mr Leung Kwok Choi made the following main points:

- (a) as the design capacity of 86 ATMs per hour of the two existing runways had not been reached, there was no need for 3RS. Even with 3RS, the “air wall” issue still needed to be resolved. Although it was said that an agreement on the airspace issue had been reached with the Mainland, no further information nor documentary proof had been made available for Members to make an informed and fair decision;
- (b) despite the Government had said that they were following up with the Mainland on the airspace issue, there was no guarantee that the agreement could be reached. An example to illustrate this point was that though the Government claimed in 2000 that the issue regarding the co-location of customs, immigration and quarantine facilities of XRL could be sorted out, the issue remained unresolved as at present;
- (c) if the airspace issue could not be resolved, the authority to regulate air traffic would be handed over to the Mainland. Members were requested to consider whether the proposal complied with the three purposes of town planning, i.e. suitability, safety and general welfare of the community, in particular safety, in making a decision;
- (d) the impact of air traffic noise on him and his wife might not be as significant as that on the other residents as they previously lived in the Kowloon City area. His wife lived on the top floor of Chi Chun Lau of Chun Seen Mei Chuen. The noise at that time was not that annoying as there were no night-time flights. They could still enjoy a good sleep at night;

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of an aircraft over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

- (e) as residents in Park Island, they were woken up a few times at night by aircraft noise;
- (f) for whatever proposal put forth by the Government, someone would bound

to be affected. For the 3RS, if it was not the Ma Wan residents, it might be the Sham Tseng or the Tsing Lung Tau residents that would be affected. Impacts on residents might not be an important consideration of the Government; and

- (g) one of the proposed financial arrangement of the 3RS was retaining the airport's surplus for financing the project. The surplus was originally part of revenue of the Treasury. To retain the surplus for investments would reduce the income of the Government. There was no justification for bypassing LegCo for funding.

22. Ms Michelle Leung made the following main points:

- (a) due to the loud aircraft noise, the residents of Park Island had to close their windows. However, even with the windows closed, the residents would still be woken up by the noise of passing aircrafts;
- (b) according to the data collected from October 2014 to September 2015 by the noise monitoring terminal installed in Block 17, Park Island, the monthly average number of aircrafts passing over Park Island was 16,545, denoting a daily average of 543. On a yearly basis, 39.4% or 78,140 aircrafts passing over Park Island had a noise level of over 65dB(A);

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of an aircraft over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

- (c) on a daily basis, 214 number of aircrafts passing over Park Island had a noise level higher than 65dB(A), i.e. one every seven minutes;
- (d) for the time slot from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., 51.6% of aircrafts passing over Park Island had a noise level higher than 65dB(A). The residents would be woken up by the loud noise every half an hour during that period. The situation would be worsened with 3RS in operation;

- (e) there had been repeated complaints on noise nuisance lodged to CAD. However, no mitigation measures had ever been implemented to ease their concern. The Secretary for Transport and Housing said that there was an agreement with the Mainland concerning the airspace issue. However, the document was not made available for public inspection. He was not sure whether there was an agreement that the Chinese Government would take over the control of air traffic. If the airspace issue could be resolved, there was no need for 3RS;
- (f) under the independent mode of 2RS, the capacity of HKIA would be 86 ATMs per hour if the airspace issue could be resolved. The construction of 3RS would be redundant. With the airspace issue unresolved, additional flights of 3RS would continue to fly to the south after passing over Ma Wan, the noise problem in Ma Wan would become even more serious;
- (g) according to the EIA report, departure flights of 3RS would fly to the north causing no noise impact to residents of Ma Wan. The assumption that flights could fly to the north had also been made in 1992 NAMP. It had been proven in the last 20 years that flight to the north was not possible. With SBIA getting busier each year, the airspace issue had become more difficult to be tackled;
- (h) during the consultation session with residents of Park Island, AAHK promised that flight path to the south would not be in operation from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.. The operation of 3RS would ease the burden of the existing runways by reducing the frequency of departure and arrival flights, which would in turn alleviate the noise caused to the Ma Wan residents. However, the promise made was based on the assumption that the airspace issue could be resolved. If the airspace issue could not be addressed, the noise problem would only be aggravated as all flights, including the additional flights of the third runway, would have to fly to the south. It was estimated that the capacity under 3RS was 102 ATMs per hour. Ma Wan would be hard hit by the frequent flights. Property price of Park

Island would drop and the noise and air pollution problems would become more serious;

- (i) the key to increase the capacity of the airport lay not in the construction of an additional runway but how the existing runways could be better utilized. Taking the London Heathrow Airport, which was one of the busiest airports in the world, as an example, its two runways could handle over 100 ATMs per hour. It almost doubled those of HKIA. Should CAD employ more air traffic regulating experts, the efficiency of the airport would be increased. 3RS was not necessary unless there was a hidden political agenda for its construction that was unknown to the public; and
- (j) despite the excessive air traffic noise in Ma Wan, she doubted if AAHK had ever penalized the airlines which did not conform to the noise standard. The proposal of installation of double glazing window and subsidies on electricity fees as compensation to local residents for noise impacts was unacceptable. The Government should not waste HK\$141.5 billion on the “White Elephant” project. For the benefits of the future generations and the welfare of the general public, Members were invited to make a conscientious decision.

[Some attendees at the meeting made a noise imitating the passage of a passenger aircraft over Ma Wan at this juncture.]

23. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Poon Wing Lok made the following main points:

- (a) as a resident of Park Island, a taxpayer and a member of the Earth, his presentation would cover nine areas;

Residents suffering from long-term disturbance of aircraft noise

- (b) the noise made by attendees at the meeting would only cause nuisance to Members for a day or half, but the nuisance caused by aircrafts to the

residents happened every night. The noise problem was more pronounced for those who lived on the top floors or in units facing the internal landscaped garden;

- (c) the daily average number of cases of aircraft noise exceeding 70dB(A) in Park Island was 19, while that in On Yam Estate, Kwai Chung and Cheung Hang Estate, Tsing Yi were only 0.7 and 1.6 respectively. Of the 19 cases, two or three of them exceeded 80dB(A). The serious noise problem had caused a decline in the quality of life of the residents;
- (d) it was suspected that if the airspace issue remained unresolved when 3RS was in operation, all flights would have to fly to the south, rendering the noise impact on the residents of Park Island more serious;

Unresolved airspace issue

- (e) HKIA was in competition with SBIA, ZJA and MIA for airspace. Because of the airspace issue, the increase in ATMs of GBIA was only one third of the original estimate. Presumably, the airspace issue should have been resolved in the 2007 Plan. However the document, for some unknown reason, was not made available for public information. In fact, the flight path to the north was in the hand of the China National Space Administration Committee. Although it was claimed that 3RS would bring about an economic return of HK\$450 billion and many new employment opportunities, the estimation was based on the assumption that the airspace issue to the north could be resolved. Besides, there were no details on how the figures were worked out;

Unsaturated capacity and low operational efficiency

- (f) HKIA had not yet reached its capacity. There was still a long way to go from the current 68 ATMs per hour to 86 ATMs per hour;
- (g) he doubted whether the estimated return was achievable taking into account

the scale of development of 3RS;

Financial arrangement issues

- (h) in view of the large amount of construction cost of HK\$141.5 billion, AAHK should not bypass the scrutiny of FC of LegCo;
- (i) under the proposed financial arrangement, 33% or HK\$47 billion of the construction cost would be from retaining the HKIA's operational surplus for project investments, and 49% or HK\$53 billion from borrowings. Since the surplus retained would have been income of the Government and interest paid for borrowings was also public money, the use of the money should be under the scrutiny of the LegCo. The proposed financial arrangement for 3RS was therefore considered procedurally unfair;
- (j) the construction cost of 3RS was 10 times higher than that of the other airports including the Calgary International Airport in Canada, the Brisbane Airport in Australia and GBIA rendering it the most expensive infrastructural project in Hong Kong;
- (k) with the construction of all the infrastructural projects at the same time, there would be competition for resources and the cost would be driven up;

Monitoring issue and high risk of cost overruns

- (l) even under the scrutiny of LegCo, there were serious delay and cost overruns of XRL. 3RS under the monitoring of a LegCo Subcommittee comprising only five engineers, amongst others, would therefore very likely have cost overruns;
- (m) taking XRL and the HZMB as examples, cost overruns of the projects were 31.2% and 17.9% of the original estimate respectively. If 3RS was going to have cost overruns of 30%, the sum involved would be tremendous;

- (n) the total cost of the nine infrastructural projects of Hong Kong was over HK\$400 billion including 66% of cost overruns. If the cost overruns of HK\$160 billion were to be distributed to the Hong Kong people, each would receive HK\$22,000. If the sum was to be used for housing development, 230,000 units of public housing could be built. Therefore, for better cost control, the financial arrangement of 3RS should not circumvent the scrutiny of LegCo;

Who would benefit from the expensive infrastructure

- (o) it was estimated that the cost of reclamation for 3RS was HK\$61.6 billion or 43.5% of the total cost of HK\$141.5 billion. As a large amount of sand and gravels were required to be imported from the Mainland, he considered that developers and the Mainland businessmen would benefit the most during the construction stage. He speculated that the project might involve transfer of benefits;
- (p) if an airport construction fee of HK\$180 was to be levied on passengers, it was estimated that the return would be higher than the construction cost. The airlines, e.g. the Cathay Pacific Airlines, would capture most of the benefits;
- (q) although it was claimed that 3RS would create a hundred thousand new employment opportunities, due to shortage of labour, the developers would import labour for the project, which would bring about vicious competition, lowering of wages and greater demand for housing. That was why 3RS was met with objections from three trade unions. Besides, contractors might exploit the workers for higher profit. An example illustrating that was the strike of XRL workers for being underpaid in April 2013;

Environmental cost

- (r) the number of CWD had already decreased as a result of the construction of HZMB. Although a marine park would later be provided, he doubted

whether CWD would return after their habitats had been destroyed. Taking into account the large-scale reclamation of 250 ha, the original state of the marine ecology might be disrupted and could not be reinstated;

Social cost

- (s) there was no social impact assessment (SIA) done for the proposal to reflect the cost of noise, air pollution, carbon emission etc, caused to the residents e.g. in Tung Chung, Ma Wan and Sham Tseng;
- (t) in the overseas experience, approval would not be given to projects which failed the SIA test;
- (u) if the construction of 3RS was to proceed, it would involve a loan of HK\$140 billion, which could be used to provide some 140,000 public housing units, 10 public hospitals and free tertiary education for 160,000 students. Besides, a sum of only HK\$10 billion could set up a trust for universal retirement protection, which would benefit all Hong Kong people;
- (v) the Government had or was prepared to spend a lot of money in infrastructure projects, such as HK\$ 84.4 billion on XRL, HK\$141.5 billion on 3RS, HK\$35.9 billion on HZMB and HK\$31.3 billion on LBCP, but was reluctant to spend on projects that could improve people's livelihood and directly benefited the community as a whole. In promoting the construction of 3RS, he doubted whether the Government had duly considered the social and environmental costs involved and the general welfare of the community;

Public opinion

- (w) a random telephone survey conducted by the Hong Kong Baptist University in 2015 showed that 68% of the 618 citizens surveyed opposed the construction of 3RS if the airspace issue remained unresolved and 60% were not satisfied that the financial arrangement would circumvent the

scrutiny of LegCo; and

- (x) over 99% of the 12,220 representations received with respect to the OZP objected to the construction of 3RS with only 4 in support of the proposal. He requested Members to use the power entrusted to them to make a decision not based on political consideration but on good utilization of resources and land use planning. The unnecessary expansion of the airport, which would waste a lot of public money with little actual use, should not be approved. The construction of 3RS should be withheld.

24. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Loletta Lau Oi Yee played a song named “三跑荒謬時” which, she said, expressed the views of Hong Kong people on the proposed 3RS. She dedicated the song particularly to AAHK and CAD.

[Some attendees, accompanied by the PowerPoint presentation, sang the song at this juncture.]

25. Since it was about time for a lunch break and the representative of C22, Mr Ip Tat Yan and the representative of C155, Ms Pong Yuen Yee were not available for the afternoon session, with the consent of Ms Loletta Lau Oi Yee, the Chairman said that the said representatives could make their oral submissions at that juncture before the Island Park Owners' Committee continued their presentation in the afternoon session.

C24 – Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance

26. Mr Ip Tat Yan made the following main points:
- (a) the Hong Kong Green Strategy Alliance supported 3RS because it would ensure the sustainable growth of Hong Kong;
 - (b) there was no objection to the 3RS project as it would have long-lasting impact on the economy, people, flora and fauna over a wide area of Hong Kong, and it was a great challenge to the various stakeholders. They trusted that through suitable stakeholder engagements and proper

implementation of all the mitigation measures, the project would bring about a win-win situation;

Environmental impact

- (c) the mitigation measures proposed in the EIA report could avoid, minimize, mitigate and compensate for the environmental impacts of the project. The use of ‘non-dredge reclamation’ for formation of 650 ha of land for the third runway was supported and the application of deep cement mixing would have less environmental impacts than the other traditional dredging techniques. However, a large-scale trial had to be undertaken on site to ensure that the practice would be carried out in a cost-effective manner;
- (d) to protect the endangered CWD, they welcomed the series of measures to be put in place, including the designation of a marine park of 2,400 ha, the establishment of a Marine Ecology Enhancement Fund and provision of support to research studies, amongst others. They suggested that independent marine experts, who would report directly to an independent environmental checker, be commissioned to oversee the environmental aspects of the project and that AAHK would take necessary actions in case the quality of the water surrounding 3RS was found to be deteriorating;
- (e) with 3RS, HKIA would have more flexibility in adjusting flight paths to reduce aircraft noise on the surroundings. To help the public to understand the project, AAHK could consider organizing a series of roadshow exhibitions with simulation videos to promote the merits and advantages of the project;

Implementation of professionalism

- (f) the project would inject 123,000 job opportunities to the market, involving engagement of professionals in preparation and execution of plans, such as budget plans, management plans and quality management plans. The project thus provided an environment to nurture talents and

professionalism;

A smarter airport

- (g) the project would cover the construction of a new passenger concourse, installation of an automatic people mover system, a baggage handling system and expansion of Terminal 2 involving wide application of information and communication technologies. That provided an opportunity to bring innovations to the aviation industry and make HKIA continued to be one of the smartest airports in the world; and

Contribution to Hong Kong's economy

- (h) the project was one of the largest and most important infrastructure development projects in Hong Kong with its construction cost at HK\$141.5 billion. The Economic Impact Analysis showed that the project would bring about an economic return of HK\$455 billion by 2061. To increase transparency, the assumptions for the estimate should be made available to the public. Necessary adjustments had to be made when the actual economic conditions deviated from the assumptions and a strict project management system had to be put in place to avoid cost overruns and project delay.

27. As the representative of C155, Ms Pong Yuen Yee, had already left the meeting, the presentation in the morning session was completed.

28. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:30 p.m.

29. The meeting was resumed at 2:55 p.m. on 11.1.2016.

30. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting :

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Professor S.C. Wong

Dr C.P. Lau

Dr W.K. Yau

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr K.F. Tang

Deputy Director of Lands

Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

Presentation and Question Sessions

[Open Meeting]

31. The following representatives of the Government, representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Donna Y.P. Tam	-	District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands (DPO/SKIs)
Mr Richard Y.L. Siu	-	Senior Town Planner/Islands (STP/Is)
Ms Helena Y.S. Pang	-	Assistant Town Planner/Islands 3 (ATP/Is 3)

Transport and Housing Bureau (THB)

Mr Wallace K.K. Lau	-	Deputy Secretary for Transport & Housing (Transport) 4 (DS(T)4)
Miss Grace W.S. Kwok	-	Principal Assistant Secretary (Airport Expansion Project Coordination Office) (PAS(AEPCO))
Mr Henry C.K. Chu	-	Chief Assistant Secretary (AEPCO) (CAS(AEPCO))

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Isaac K.S. Lo	-	Senior Engineer/Islands (SE/Is)
Mr Gabriel K.Y. Lau	-	Engineer/Islands 2 (E/Is)

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

Mr Louis P.L. Chan - Principal Environmental Protection Officer
(Regional Assessment) (PEPO (RA))

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Mr Dick K.C. Choi - Senior Marine Conservation Officer (West)
(SMOC(W))

Marine Department (MD)

Mr C.M. Chau - General Manager/Planning, Development and
Port Security (GM/PD&PS)

Mr Tony T.F. Li - Senior Marine Officer/Planning &
Development 3 (SMO/P&D3)

Mr P. Zou - Marine Officer/Planning & Development(3)
(MO/P&D3)

Civil Aviation Department (CAD)

Mr Gabriel P.K. Cheng - Chief (Technical and Development)
(C(TD))

Mr Raymond C.O. Ng - Chief Safety Officer (Airport & Safety
Regulation) (CSO(A&SR))

Mr Samuel Ng - Senior Evaluation Officer (1) (SEVO(1))

Ms Y.Y. Wong - Operations Officer (Environmental
Management) 1

Representers, Commenters and their representatives

R8 – 新民主同盟荃灣工作隊

C131 – Green Sense

Mr Tam Hoi Pong - Representer / Commenter

R9 – Lo Mei Wan

Mr Lun Chi Wai - Representer's representative

R11 – Chan Chiu Lan

Ms Chan Chiu Lan - Representer

R12 – Leung Mei Kuen

Mr Ng Chi Wai - Representer's representative

R14 – 一批馬灣居民

Ms Shirley Wong Hang Wan - Representers' representative

R15 – Loletta Lau Oi Yee

R12042 – 梁美娟

C201 – Chung Mei Ling

C202 – 李偉雄

C203 – 鄭劍夫

C204 – Chan Ida

C205 – Michelle Keung

C206 – Tin Shui Wah

C207 – Cheng Wai Yin

C208 – Chan Tak Fung

C209 – Lam Wai Man

C210 – Lam Pei Li, Beelie

C211 – 劉藹宜

C213 – 陳少珊

C330 – 李妙儀

C331 – 吳志強

Ms Bonnie Chan Pui Shan]

Ms Sylvia Lee Siu Fong] Representers and Commenters'

(Park Island Owners'] representatives

Committee)]

C1 – Airport Authority Hong Kong

C122 – Lee Ping Kuen

Mr Wilson Fung]

Mr Tommy Leung] Commenters' representatives

Mr Peter Lee]

Ms Billie Leung]

C10 – Cathay Pacific Services Limited

Mr Kelvin Ko - Commenter's representative

C11 – Hong Kong Airport Services Limited

Ms Jodi C.M. Kwok - Commenter's representative

C12 – Cathay Pacific Airways Limited

Mr James W.P. Tong - Commenter's representative

C13 – Hong Kong Dragon Airlines Limited

Mr Alex Lau - Commenter's representative

C14 – Cathay Pacific Catering Services (HK) Limited

Mr Andy M.K. Wong - Commenter's representative

C15 – Board of Airlines Representatives Hong Kong

Mr Wyn Li - Commenter's representative

C22 – Hong Kong Strategy

Ms Lam Wai Sham - Commenter's representative

C31 – Air Hong Kong

Mr Teddy Lee - Commenter's representative

C32 – Airline Operator's Committee

Mr Cheng Hak Him - Commenter's representative

C40 – Hong Kong Professionals and Senior Executives Association

Mr Stephen Chan - Commenter's representative

C135 – Mak Hei Man

Ms Mak Hei Man - Commenter

C151 – Lingo Lingo

Ms Man Pui Ha - Commenter's representative

C329 – 吳家聰

Mr Wan Yu Ting - Commenter's representative

32. The Chairman extended a welcome to the government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives. He then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

C1 – Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK)

C122 – Lee Ping Kuen

33. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wilson Fung made the following main points :

- (a) since the commissioning of the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) at Chek Lap Kok in 1998, the number of air passengers, air cargo and air traffic movements (ATMs) had increased by more than 100% and that was in line with the global trend. Although there were fluctuations over the period, the air traffic industry was resilient and could quickly recover from the economic downturn;
- (b) in the past 10 years, there was an average annual growth of 4.3% in the global air traffic volume, and the average annual growth in China and the Pearl River Delta (PRD) region were 13.1% and 8% respectively. The HKIA Master Plan 2030 (MP2030) completed in 2008 had projected an annual growth of 3.7% for the period from 2014 to 2030. The annual growth was subsequently revised to 3.3% in 2012, taking into account the constraint of the airport capacity. Those projections were lower than the

actual annual growth of 4.7% recorded over the period from 2000 to 2014 and were considered conservative;

- (c) it was projected in the MP2030 that the maximum capacity of the 2 runway system (2RS) at 68 ATMs per hour (annual total of 420,000 ATMs) would be saturated by around 2019. However, the actual growth was much faster and the total number of ATMs per hour projected for 2018 was achieved in 2014. It was estimated that the maximum capacity of 2RS would be reached by end 2016/early 2017. There was a pressing need to develop the third runway system (3RS) in order to cope with the increasing demand;

- (d) the capacity of HKIA was not derived simply from multiplying the number of runways by the carrying capacity of each runway, as perceived by many representers. The following constraints should also be considered in determining the capacity of HKIA :
 - (i) the topography – as compared with London Heathrow Airport which had no topographical constraint on the flight routes at landing and take-off, HKIA was constrained by the mountains in Lantau at its south;

 - (ii) the layout of runways – the orientation and separation distance between runways in the same airport would cause interference with each other and affect the capacity of individual runway. As illustrated by Chicago O'Hare International Airport (8 runways), Amsterdam Airport Schiphol (6 runways), Guangzhou Baiyun International Airport (3 runways), the capacity of those airports was not greater than that of HKIA in proportion to the number of additional runways;

 - (iii) the fleet mix (i.e. proportion of types of aircrafts) using the airport – wide-bodied aircraft would have greater wake turbulence

and the aircraft behind required a greater separation distance, hence affecting the maximum number of aircrafts that could operate on a particular runway. While London Heathrow Airport could handle more than 80 ATMs per hour due to a higher proportion of narrow-bodied aircrafts, HKIA with a higher proportion of wide-bodied aircrafts could not handle the same number of aircrafts;

- (iv) the mode of runway operation – the maximum capacity of 86 ATMs per hour for 2RS as stated in the New Airport Master Plan (NAMP) published in 1992 could only be achievable if 2RS was operated under an ‘independent mixed mode’, i.e. each runway could handle landing and take-off independently and not affected by the other runway. The 1992 NAMP had stated that the ‘independent mixed mode’ operation at HKIA was not practicable as there was topographical constraint;
- (e) since the 1992 NAMP, CAD had commissioned consultancy studies in 1994 and 2008 to examine the maximum capacity of HKIA. With the implementation of improvement measures recommended in the 2008 study, 2RS at HKIA had achieved a maximum capacity of 68 ATMs per hour. The capacity of HKIA was comparable with that of Singapore Changi Airport, Dubai International Airport and Bangkok Suvarnabhumi Airport all operating on 2RS;
- (f) in planning 3RS, AAHK had examined all 5 airports in the PRD region (i.e. Hong Kong, Guangzhou, Shenzhen, Zhuhai and Macau) and their expansion plans. It was anticipated that the overall capacity of these airports could reach a total number of 289 million passengers in year 2030. However, the combined capacity of these airports fell short of the overall annual demand forecast of 380 million passengers. The expansion plans for these airports aimed at meeting their own demand, rather than sharing the passenger load. The forecast of air passenger

growth at 7.3% per year was considered reasonable having regards to the actual compound annual growth in air passengers from 2008 to 2014 at 8.7%;

- (g) HKIA had been collaborating with Shenzhen Airport through passenger transfer at the SkyPier. However, it was impractical not to develop 3RS in HKIA but to rely on Shenzhen Airport to handle the increasing passenger demand. The joint operation with nearby airports could only handle about 0.3% of the overall air passenger volume in the region and it was inconvenient for passengers from the Mainland cities to fly to overseas via the transfer from Zhuhai/Shenzhen to HKIA;

[Ms Christina M. Lee arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (h) a study on cities with two or more airports revealed that there was no successful example of increasing passenger throughput by collaboration between connecting airports as inter-airport transfer was not attractive to users. The study for the proposed third runway of the London Heathrow Airport concluded that airlines based at one large airport could be benefited from economies of scale in terms of staff utilisation, overheads and effective utilisation of feeder traffic networks while those with feeder traffic between two airports would risk a substantial loss of passengers. A third runway was thus proposed for the London Heathrow Airport; and
- (i) the responses to questions on airport management, Midfield Development Project, noise issue, Chinese White Dolphins (CWD), finance arrangement, Terminal 2, low-cost carriers (LCC), Express Rail Line (XRL), SkyPier and Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge (HZMB) had been prepared and could be provided if necessary at the Q&A session.

34. In response to Mr Lun Chi Wai (representative of R9)'s query on whether the Chairman, Members as well as those making oral submissions should declare their interests,

the Chairman said that Members' declaration of interests had already been dealt with in the morning session which would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. The identities of representers and commenters, including the organisations they represented were already public information and it was not necessary for them to declare interests. The established procedures for declaration of interest had been followed.

[Dr W.K. Yau left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C10 – Cathay Pacific Services Limited (CPSL)

35. Mr Kelvin Ko made the following main points :

- (a) the 3RS project and the amendments to the Chek Lap Kok Outline Zoning Plan (CLK OZP) in respect of the 3RS were supported;
- (b) CPSL was operating one of the cargo freight stations in HKIA. There had been a steady and continuous growth in passenger and cargo freight in HKIA from 1.63 million tonnes in 1998 to 4.38 million tonnes in 2014, representing an average annual growth of 6%. There was a need to speed up infrastructure improvement to keep up with the growth; and
- (c) due to its geographical location, high efficiency and ability to maintain a high ATMs, HKIA became one of the busiest airports in 2010 and had been in the leading position since then. The value of the cargo handled was equivalent to 39% of the total annual overseas trade in Hong Kong. As there was capacity constraint in HKIA, airlines were unable to obtain the best take-off/landing slots, preventing Hong Kong from further expanding its cargo freight business. A third runway was necessary to address the capacity constraint and to maintain the competitiveness of HKIA. Airport expansion would also have a positive impact on the economy and provide job opportunities.

C11 – Hong Kong Airport Services Limited (HKASL)

36. Ms Jodi C.M. Kwok made the following main points :

- (a) HKASL had over 3,200 staff and provided ground services to 24 airlines at HKIA. They supported the 3RS project and the amendments to the CLK OZP for the continuous development of HKIA;
- (b) the continuous growth in ATMs had exerted pressure on the operation at the airport apron and the airport terminals. The difficulty in providing sufficient boarding gates, boarding counters, aircraft parking and staff supporting facilities would seriously affect the flight punctuality, efficiency of ground service as well as the operational safety at the apron;
- (c) although the Midfield Development Project at HKIA could increase the number of aircraft parking spaces to relieve the crowded situation, the 3RS project would be the long-term solution to meet the increasing aviation demand. The capacity of HKIA should be increased to reinforce its leading position as an aviation hub and the competitiveness of Hong Kong;
- (d) the 3RS project would improve the efficiency and services of HKIA to air passengers and would also provide job opportunities to labours with different skill levels in the construction and service industries. The 3RS project would be beneficial to the economy of Hong Kong in general; and
- (e) HKASL would take corresponding measures to protect the environment by using electric vehicles by 2017 and electric-powered equipment in providing ground services.

C12 – Cathay Pacific Airways Limited (CPAL)

37. Mr James W.P. Tong made the following main points :

- (a) the amendments to the CLK OZP were supported. The OZP was necessary for the 3RS project proposed by AAHK;
- (b) the 3RS project was necessary as the capacity of HKIA was near saturation. Similar to the situation in Kai Tak Airport in the 1990s, airport expansion was urgently required to maintain Hong Kong's competitiveness and its advantage as an aviation hub. The development of 4 major economic pillars (i.e. financial services, trading and logistics, tourism, and professional and producer service) relied on good connectivity to the world through efficient air traffic. The 3RS project was the only feasible long-term solution to ensure the competitiveness of Hong Kong and its development;
- (c) the 3RS project was important to the air traffic industry as well as the economy of Hong Kong as the aviation industry accounted for about 8% of the work force in Hong Kong and 8% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). There were about 65,000 workers at HKIA in 2013, representing an increase of more than 44% since 1998. The 3RS would increase the number of direct/indirect job opportunities at HKIA from 124,000 to 140,000;
- (d) the existing HKIA was operating near its capacity and it was difficult for airlines to introduce additional flights. The capacity problem was more acute during the peak travelling seasons and during typhoons, which adversely affected the quality of air service;
- (e) the 3RS project would take 10 years to complete, long after the capacity of HKIA had been reached. As neighbouring airports in the PRD region, Singapore and Korea were actively planning for expansion, the 3RS project at HKIA should be implemented as soon as possible to maintain our competitiveness;

- (f) a balance should be struck between economic development and environmental protection and CPAL was committed to contribute towards environmental protection by purchasing 70 more environmental friendly aircrafts by 2024. Those new aircrafts would be more efficient, quieter and have less carbon emission. It was expected that the aircraft noise level of each aircraft could be reduced by 10dB(A) by 2020 which would help addressing the concerns on aircraft noise; and
- (g) the development of 3RS should not be delayed as Hong Kong's leading position as an aviation hub would be challenged by competing airports in the region, which would be detrimental to the aviation industry as well as our economy, business and tourism.

C13 – Hong Kong Dragon Airlines Limited (HKDAL)

38. Mr Alex Lau made the following main points :

- (a) HKDAL was a Hong Kong based airline established 30 years ago, with 52 flight routes (including 23 routes to Mainland). The company supported the amendments to the CLK OZP;
- (b) due to the rapid increase in the air traffic, the capacity of HKIA would be saturated sooner than expected. The 3RS project would help maintain the aviation hub status of HKIA and the competitiveness of Hong Kong;
- (c) the high efficiency of HKIA was a strong foundation for the aviation industry and it supported the 4 major economic pillars, i.e. financial services, trading and logistics, tourism, and professional and producer services. As mentioned by C12, there were about 65,000 workers and 124,000 direct/indirect job opportunities in HKIA in 2013. The 3RS development would further increase the number of jobs opportunities to 140,000;

- (d) with rapid economic growth in China and in the Asia-Pacific region, many airports were planning for expansion while HKIA was constrained by its capacity, which posed a challenge to its growth. There was a pressing need to expand HKIA to 3RS;
- (e) due to capacity constraint of HKIA, airlines had difficulties in increasing the number of flights to clear the passenger backlog after typhoons and inclement weather. While CAD and AAHK had carried out measures such as Midfield Development Project and terminal expansion to improve the situation, 3RS was necessary as a long-term solution for providing a smooth and efficient service to air passengers; and
- (f) there should be a balance between environmental protection and economic development. HKDAL was willing to cooperate with AAHK in mitigating environmental impacts of the 3RS project by setting targets in fuel efficiency and carbon emission of aircrafts. The 3RS would enable Hong Kong to take advantage of the rapid growing aviation market in China and HKIA to maintain its leading position.

C14 – Cathay Pacific Catering Services (H.K.) Limited (CPCSL)

39. Mr Andy M.K. Wong made the following main points :

- (a) CPCSL supported the amendments to the CLK OZP as it would facilitate the 3RS project at HKIA;
- (b) HKIA was an important infrastructure for Hong Kong as it would bring economic benefit to Hong Kong as a whole by supporting the financial services, trading and logistics, tourism, and professional and producer services. Hong Kong's advantage in the 4 major economic pillars should not be weakened by not taking forward the 3RS project;

- (c) as a catering operators serving HKIA, CPCS had confident in Hong Kong and would continue to invest on the relevant infrastructure. While recognising the need to strike a balance between development and environmental protection, targets had been set to reduce the carbon emission in the coming 5 years by replacing their outdated delivery trucks and machineries. The 3RS project would enable HKIA and their company to grow further;
- (d) diverting flights and passengers to other airports in the PRD region was not supported as that would not be conducive to the economic development of Hong Kong; and
- (e) the Midfield Development Project was only a medium-term measure that could not satisfy the long-term aviation demand. Airports in the PRD region and other Asian cities were already expanding which posed a threat to the leading position of HKIA. The 3RS project should not be delayed any further.

C15 – Board of Airlines Representatives Hong Kong (BARHK)

40. Mr Wyn Li made the following main points :

- (a) BARHK representing 76 airlines (including over 70 international airlines) considered that the 3RS project was important from the international airlines' perspective and supported the amendments to the CLK OZP, which was vital to the implementation of 3RS;
- (b) HKIA was fast growing. According to the AAHK 2014-15 annual report, there was an increase in the number of air passengers by 6.6% to 64.7 million, an increase in ATMs by 4.9% to 396,000, and an increase in cargo freight by 5.5% to 4.4 million tonnes. In terms of cargo movement, HKIA was the busiest airport for 5 consecutive years. The 3RS project was necessary to maintain the leading position of HKIA;

- (c) airport development would have impact on the environment and airlines would take measures in accordance with requirements set down by International Air Transport Association (IATA) in increasing the fuel efficiency of aircrafts while reducing carbon emission and noise; and
- (d) the capacity constraint of HKIA would affect the flight service, especially during typhoons, and limit the opportunity for service expansion. The Midfield Development Project was not adequate in addressing the capacity problem. There were rapid expansions in neighbouring airports. If the 3RS project was not implemented in time, airlines might choose to establish flight routes to other airports and Hong Kong would lose its competitiveness. The longer we delayed in developing 3RS, the more likely that the leading position of HKIA would be undermined. The job market would also be affected as no new job opportunities would be created.

C22 – Hong Kong Strategy (HKS)

41. Ms Lam Wai Sham made the following main points :

- (a) HKS was a group of Hong Kong citizen with common background who had served the former members of the Central Policy Unit of the Hong Kong Special Administration Region (HKSAR). They had no political affiliation but shared a common interest and concern on the well-being of Hong Kong. HKS supported the 3RS project and believed that it was the only viable way to ensure the long-term competitiveness of Hong Kong as a prime aviation hub;
- (b) global aviation connectivity was important to the role of Hong Kong as an international business hub. Airports in the neighbouring cities, e.g. Singapore, Seoul, Shanghai, Guangzhou and Shenzhen, were actively expanding and HKIA was facing fierce competition. International

airlines might choose to land their airplanes in other airports if HKIA was constrained by the capacity of the existing 2RS. Hong Kong would lose its competitiveness and economic benefits;

- (c) since its inauguration in 1998, HKIA had become the world's busiest airport. In 2014, HKIA handled 63.3 million passengers, 4.38 million tonnes of cargo and 391,000 flights, representing an annual growth of 5.7%, 6% and 5.1% respectively. When 3RS was completed, HKIA could handle 100 million passengers, 9 million tonnes of cargo and more than 600,000 flights. Without 3RS, HKIA would not be able to meet the aviation demand. The capacity issue, if not addressed, would have significant impact on the aviation network and the pricing of air tickets, deterring overseas visitors and damaging the status of HKIA as an international aviation hub;
- (d) HKIA had contributed to the economic growth of Hong Kong and provided support to the 4 pillar industries, i.e. financial services, trading and logistics, tourism, and professional and producer services, which accounted for 57.8% of the total GDP in 2013. The economy of Hong Kong relied on the smooth and efficient air passenger and cargo movements. HKIA also provided jobs on site as well as indirect job opportunities in the hospitality, catering, tourism and retail sectors, amounting up to 5% of the total employed population. When the 3RS was operational, the contribution in those aspects would increase;
- (e) the number of visitors was important to the growth of the retail and tourism industries. Visitors' spending accounted for about 20.3% of the value of the total retail sales in 2004, and it had increased to 38.3% in 2013. Further increase in visitors would be expected as there was a strong growth in the aviation demand;
- (f) the 3RS project was extremely important to the economic growth of Hong Kong and should be implemented subject to resolution of all

concerns raised. The key question was not whether to build 3RS, but how to reduce its construction costs and minimise its environmental impacts. According to AAHK, the construction costs would be increased by \$7 billion for each delayed year. If 3RS was constructed earlier, it could benefit Hong Kong more; and

- (g) noting that the 3RS project would have negative impacts on the environment of Lantau and Ma Wan, AAHK should meet all Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) requirements and strike a balance between development and conservation. The public should be provided with a report explicitly explaining the mitigation measures to be taken during the construction and operational phases. A cross-sector discussion on how to integrate hospitality, catering and logistics facilities for the implementation of 3RS so as to maintain Hong Kong's leading role as an international business hub should be arranged. Hong Kong needed to expand its tourist facilities and enhance travellers' experience in order not to lose our appeals and attractiveness to visitors.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left this session of the meeting at this point.]

42. Noting a Member's view that commenters should elaborate on their views rather than reading out their written submissions, the Chairman suggested that commenters and their representatives should not make unnecessarily long and repetitive oral submission.

C31 – Air Hong Kong (AHK)

43. Mr Teddy Lee made the following main points :

- (a) he represented Air Hong Kong, which provided solely cargo freight services. AHK supported the amendments to the CLK OZP and the 3RS project in order to ensure that HKIA could continue to grow and maintain its competitiveness as an aviation hub;

- (b) cargo freight services relied on a wide aviation network and frequent flight schedules that enabled timely goods delivery. The 2RS at HKIA would soon reach its capacity and such a limitation would adversely affect the cargo freight operation and impose constraint on the aviation development in Hong Kong. A highly efficient airport was important to the aviation industry, particularly the cargo freight business;
- (c) as the 3RS project would take a long time to complete, the capacity of HKIA would be saturated before that. The project should not be further delayed;
- (d) airport development would have negative impacts on the environment and AHK would work closely with IATA and the concerned authority to take measures in minimising the impacts on the environment; and
- (e) the development potential of the air cargo freight market in Asia was big. Through the 3RS project, the aviation industry and the general economy of Hong Kong could benefit by taking advantage of that growing aviation market.

[Mr H.W. Cheung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C32 – Airline Operator’s Committee (AOC)

44. Mr Cheng Hak Him made the following main points :

- (a) he gave a brief description of AOC and said that AOC supported the amendments to the CLK OZP and the 3RS project;
- (b) HKIA was one of the fastest growing airports in the world and contributed a lot in supporting the 4 major economic pillar industries in Hong Kong. As the capacity of HKIA was about to be saturated,

various operators would face tremendous challenges in maintaining the efficient operation of HKIA;

- (c) the capacity problem and the shortage of aircraft parking spaces would affect passenger boarding, luggage claiming and other operational safety issues, and undermine the ability to respond to unexpected flight schedule changes during typhoon. AOC was concerned about the ability of HKIA to maintain its leading role as an aviation hub in Asia and considered that actions should be taken immediately to address the capacity problem;
- (d) airport development would have adverse impacts on the environment. While airlines would take measures to minimise the impacts on the environment by investing on modern aircrafts, operators providing ground services would also take steps by reducing waste through recycling, as well as reducing carbon emission and the use of fuel by replacing the outdated vehicles and equipment; and
- (e) the future of Hong Kong economy would depend heavily on the airport expansion. Any delay in the 3RS project would adversely affect the quality of service to passengers and bring unnecessary pressure on the frontline staff. HKIA was urgently in need of expansion to maintain its high efficiency and to continue its high quality services to passengers.

45. Mr Tam Hoi Pong (C131) said that he would let a representative of the Park Island Owners' Committee speak first. He also requested the Secretary to repeat the declaration of interests of Members to address Mr Lun (representative of R9)'s earlier concerns. The Chairman invited Ms Bonnie Chan Pui Shan to make her submission and said that the Secretary would read out Members' declaration of interest afterwards.

46. Ms Bonnie Chan Pui Shan, one of the representatives of the Park Island Owners' Committee set out in paragraph 11, made the following main points :

- (a) she did not want to stay silent as it might be taken as her agreement to accept the 3RS project and the aircraft noise nuisance at Ma Wan;
- (b) she queried whether the Board really wanted to listen to the residents' views as speaking times were only allotted to those who would attend the meeting. She was also not satisfied that the meeting was held in normal office hours and many representers/commenters might need to take leave from work to attend the meeting. She invited Members to come to Ma Wan for a meeting at night time to experience the aircraft noise there;
- (c) residents of Ma Wan were mimicking the noise of aircraft in the morning session so that Members could feel how it was like when living in Ma Wan. The residents had to live with frequent disturbance from aircraft noise every night and could not enjoy the basic right of having a quality sleep because of noisy aircrafts flying over Ma Wan every few minutes throughout the night the whole year round;
- (d) the residents of Ma Wan opposed the 3RS project and considered that the construction costs of \$141.5 billion were not well spent. The Government should not ignore the views of residents;
- (e) she moved to Ma Wan 12 years ago for its tranquil environment and fresh air. However, the quiet environment was ruined and the air was polluted by passing aircrafts. It was also not fair to the residents that they had to close the windows to mitigate the noise. The passing aircrafts at late night were mostly cargo aircrafts and were very noisy and it was like sleeping in Nathan Road amongst busy traffic;
- (f) the 3RS project would involve reclamation and a conservation fund was proposed to be set up to mitigate the environmental impacts. The 'destroy first, mitigate later' approach of the 3RS project was not acceptable. A number of issues, e.g. airspace, had not been resolved but the 3RS development was pressed ahead hastily as in the case of XRL;

- (g) the stakeholders in the aviation industry would certainly support the 3RS project as they would benefit from the development. The Board was urged to consider the proposal from the residents' point of view, who would not benefit from the development in any way; and
- (h) her 3-year old daughter was woken up by the noise of passing aircrafts and she felt helpless for not able to do anything to help her daughter sleep. Moving out of Ma Wan was not easy for her. Her friend told her that take-off/landing at the old Kai Tak Airport was prohibited after 11:00 p.m. She wondered why HKIA could operate on a 24-hours basis.

47. Mr Tam Hoi Pong (C131) said that he would speak for R8 and C131 for 20 minutes while Ms Man Pui Ha would speak for C151. The Chairman invited the Secretary to repeat Members' declaration of interests. The Secretary did so, as recorded in paragraphs 5 to 7 of the minutes on 14.12.2015 and paragraph 5 of the minutes on 16.12.2015.

R8 – 新民主同盟荃灣工作隊

C131 – Green Sense

48. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Tam Hoi Pong showed the real-time flight information in the vicinity of HKIA via 'flightradar24' and made the following main points :

- (a) he was an elected District Council member in the Ma Wan constituency and took part in the representation made by R8 and also represented Green Sense (C131);
- (b) the credibility of consultancy reports quoted by AAHK in its presentation earlier was questionable as the consultants were commissioned by AAHK. They would prepare the reports to AAHK's favour;

- (c) he had been monitoring aircraft movements through ‘flightradar24’ and observed that the busiest time at HKIA was at dusk and in the evening. While the airspace was not crowded at the time of the meeting as it was not the busiest time of the day, aircrafts could be seen flying in from the west for landing at HKIA and took-off towards the east. Aircrafts taking off towards the east would make a right turn near Park Island, causing noise nuisance to the residents;
- (d) the cargo aircrafts of AHK taking-off at night was fully loaded and could not climb to a high altitude when they approached Park Island. Those cargo aircrafts caused the most severe noise impact on Park Island;
- (e) the airspace triangle formed between HKIA, Macau and Shenzhen airports was the busiest airspace as most aircrafts of those airports would go through that area. As pointed out by Mr Lam Chiu Ying (C128) in the morning session, that airspace was so crowded that it could not accommodate the additional aircrafts from the third runway. Therefore, 3RS could not help much in increasing the capacity of HKIA without first resolving the constraint of that airspace. Furthermore, aircrafts departing from the future third runway would not have adequate vertical separation from those aircrafts flying to/from Shenzhen Airport;
- (f) when 3RS was in operation, the middle runway would be used for aircraft departure. Aircrafts taking-off towards the east could not fly north due to airspace issue, hence would need to take a detour over Ma Wan in order to climb to a suitable altitude before flying north. The Ma Wan residents would suffer from aircraft noise taking-off from both the south and middle runways;
- (g) according to a diagram extracted from the EIA submitted by AAHK, it was assumed that departing aircrafts could take a northerly route (Track 3) towards Shenzhen. However, that flight route had never been used

since the inauguration of HKIA due to the aforesaid airspace issue. That issue should be resolved before committing the 3RS project;

- (h) 'flightrade24' had shown the flight route of an aircraft flying from HKIA to the Shenzhen Airport, which flew around the southern side of Lantau before flying north. That illustrated the presence of an "air wall" between Hong Kong and Shenzhen;
- (i) there were inadequate aircraft parking spaces at Terminal 1. As a result, passengers had to take shuttle buses to go to HKIA North Satellite Concourse for boarding. The Midfield Development Project had only 20 aircraft parking spaces, which were not adequate;
- (j) according to AAHK, the maximum capacity of the existing 2RS was 68 ATMs per hour. Assuming that the airspace issue could be resolved, the capacity of the existing 2RS could reach 86 ATMs per hour and 102 ATMs per hour for 3RS. He doubted that the airspace issue could be satisfactorily resolved and in that case, the capacity of 3RS could only reach 88-90 ATMs per hour according to a report from Ming Pao in March 2015 quoting its source from the THB. The Government should concentrate its effort on resolving the airspace issue to increase the capacity of 2RS to 86 ATMs per hour instead of pursuing the 3RS project with airspace constraint at a capacity of 88-90 ATMs per hour;
- (k) a concern group on the third runway development had recorded that at 11:30 p.m. on 23.5.2015, there were 38 landed aircrafts waiting at the taxiway for parking spaces to unload the passengers due to the suspension of apron operation during thunderstorm. The HKIA needed more aircraft parking spaces instead of a third runway; and
- (l) in conclusion, the Board should not agree to the 3RS project, which involved spending \$141.5 billion public money without first resolving the airspace issue.

C135 – Mak Hei Man

49. Ms Mak Hei Man made the following main points :

- (a) she had been assisting Dr Samuel Hung (R388) on the conservation of CWD and helping the Hong Kong Dolphin Conservation Society in enhancing the public's awareness of protecting CWD since 2012;
- (b) in view of the irreversible impacts of 3RS on the habitats of CWD and her doubts on the necessity and effectiveness of the third runway, she opposed the 3RS project and objected to the CLK OZP;
- (c) CWD were important to Hong Kong and they were the mascot of Hong Kong when the sovereignty of the territory was returned to Mainland in 1997;

[Mr Roger K.H. Luk left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (d) CWD were on top of the food chain in the ocean and were important to the ecological balance of the marine lives. The decrease in the number of CWD from 158 in 2003 to 61 in 2014 (60% decrease) indicated that the habitats of the CWD had been destroyed by the cumulative impacts of reclamation projects, water pollution and engine noise from high-speed ferries;
- (e) CWD were observed to move away from areas affected by reclamation works. Pollution in the ocean had also increased the mortality rate of young CWD;
- (f) the waters at Lantau was an important ecological corridor, linking up several important habitats visited by CWD, including the Sha Chau and Lung Kwu Chau Marine Park (MP) to the northwest of Lantau set up in

1996 for the protection of CWD, the committed Brothers Islands MP to the northeast as a mitigation measure for the HZMB project, and the water near Tai O. In the event that that ecological corridor was severed by the 3RS project, the habitats for CWD would be isolated from one another;

- (g) CWD were driven away by the construction of the HZMB project. There used to be CWD near the Brothers Islands and Yam O in the summer of 2012, but they had now disappeared. Since the commencement of reclamation for the HZMB project (about 160 ha) in 2012, which was equivalent to a quarter of the 3RS reclamation, the number of CWD in the area had decreased by over 60% in that year;
- (h) a MP was proposed near the Brothers Islands for the protection of CWD to mitigate the loss of habitat in relation to the HZMB project. Likewise, a MP was also proposed in the 3RS project as a mitigation measure. However, such a measure was useless as those MPs could only be commissioned after the completion of the relevant projects and the CWD were already driven away;
- (i) the EIA for the 3RS project was still subject to judicial review (JR) and there were possibilities that the Environmental Permit (EP) issued under the EIA Ordinance would be revoked. The Board should not make a decision on the 3RS project before the judgement for the JR was made; and
- (j) mitigation measures were proposed for the 3RS project, including the designation of a 2,400 ha MP and the route diversion of high-speed ferries from the SkyPier. The effectiveness of the proposed MP in protecting CWD was in doubt as it allowed a higher speed for boats (15 knots) as opposed to 10 knots in other MPs and the diverted ferry routes would still pose danger to CWD.

[Dr C.P. Lau left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C151 – Lingo Lingo

50. Ms Man Pui Ha made the following main points :

- (a) the aircrafts passing over Ma Wan were very noisy and woke her up frequently even though she was a heavy sleeper;
- (b) there was an average of 7-8 aircrafts passing by per hour. It was torturing for residents in Park Island to be woken up by the noise of those aircrafts every few minutes and could not get good quality sleep the whole year round;
- (c) the Government should spend the public money wisely and not on something that was not needed, e.g. XRL. The construction costs of \$141.5 billion for 3RS, which was more than the construction cost of HKIA when it was first built, was not well spent. Although AAHK claimed that 3RS would generate job opportunities and have positive impacts on the economy in the long run, the money should be better spent on social welfare projects to help those in need;
- (d) she doubted whether 3RS would benefit the Meetings, Incentives, Conferences, and Events (MICE) development, as claimed by one of the earlier speakers. From her experience, the downward trend in the patronage of MICE development was the result of the general economic downturn and the impacts of the internet, rather than the hindrance by the capacity of HKIA;
- (e) the patronage and usage of Terminal 2 was low and it was more akin to a shopping mall. The Government should learn from the mistakes of Terminal 2 and re-think about 3RS;

- (f) the 3RS project involved reclamation works, which would destroy the habitat of CWD;
- (g) the airspace issue and the boundary-crossing control arrangement at the XRL terminal might affect the autonomy of Hong Kong and damage the ‘one country – two systems’ policy; and
- (h) Members were invited to spend a night at Ma Wan to experience the aircraft noise before making a decision on the 3RS project.

51. Mr Wan Yu Ting (the representative of C329) requested to speak first and there was no objection from other commenters at the meeting. The Chairman then invited Mr Wan to make his oral submission.

[Mr Ivan C.S. Fu left this session of the meeting at this point.]

C329 – 吳家聰

52. Mr Wan Yu Ting made the following main points :

- (a) Members’ patience in listening to the views of the representers and commenters was appreciated. While he was not opposing the 3RS project and airport expansion, he was against its development without first solving the road transport connection problem;
- (b) at 7:40pm on 13 December 2015, the Tsing Ma Bridge was closed for inspection due to an accident in which a ship had damaged the underside of the bridge, resulting in traffic chaos. That illustrated the inadequacy in the road network serving Lantau and Ma Wan;
- (c) the road/rail connection via Tsing Ma Bridge, which was the only road connection between HKIA and the urban area, could not cope with the additional traffic demand arising from more air passengers brought in by

3RS. As the proposed Tsing Lung Bridge and the Yam O to Kennedy Town highway were not implemented, further increase in the number of passengers through Tsing Ma Bridge would only worsen the situation. Both residents and visitors would suffer from the inadequate road connection;

- (d) the rail capacity was also inadequate as the Airport Express and the MTR Tung Chung Line shared the same section of rail tracks at Tsing Ma Bridge. Residents of Ma Wan had to wait 6 minutes at Tsing Yi Station for MTR trains at the moment. Any further increase in the number of passengers associated with 3RS would also worsen the situation;
- (e) he said that 3RS would not necessarily increase the number of visiting passengers. As the products sold in HKIA were available worldwide, there was no reason why they should shop in Hong Kong. HKIA did not have other attractions for visitors; and
- (f) Members should consider the overall benefits of Hong Kong rather than just the 3RS project in a piecemeal manner.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 3 minutes.]

[Ms Christina M. Lee left this session of the meeting temporarily and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R11 – Chan Chiu Lan

53. Ms Chan Chiu Lan made the following main points :

- (a) she used to live in Kowloon Tsai, which was underneath the flight paths of the former Kai Tak Airport. She did not find the aircraft noise in those days disturbing as there were no flights after 11:00pm;

- (b) she moved to Park Island in 2002 and discovered that Ma Wan was located near flight paths. The frequency of passing aircrafts had increased over the years, including those late night flights;
- (c) Park Island was not included as a noise sensitive receiver in the EIA of the 3RS project even though it was severely affected. It was not fair to the residents of Park Island. The 3RS project should not proceed as the assessment had ignored the noise impact on Park Island residents and was not carried out properly; and
- (d) many infrastructure developments, not supported by the public, were pressed ahead and all of them had cost overruns. She urged the Board to consider the necessity of the 3RS project carefully.

54. Ms Chan played an audio recording made by Park Island residents expressing their opposing views to the 3RS project on the grounds of the high construction cost, the airspace issue, damage to the natural environment, alternative solutions, and the noise and air pollution to Park Island caused by aircrafts. The Chairman noted the opposing views expressed by the Park Island residents in the audio recording and reminded her that her speaking time was up.

[Ms Christina M. Lee returned to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

55. A Member queried whether those residents expressing their views in the audio recording had also submitted written representations/comments as the Board only invited representers/commenters who had submitted written representations/comments to make oral submissions. In response, the Chairman said that flexibility had been exercised to treat the short audio recording as forming part of Ms Chan's presentation.

56. As a follow-up of his request in the morning, Mr Lun Chi Wai (the representative of R9) asked whether he could obtain a copy of the PowerPoint prepared by government representatives. In response, the Secretary said that the requested PowerPoint presentation would be uploaded to the Board's website for reference.

R9 – Lo Mei Wan

57. Mr Lun Chi Wai played two video recordings of aircrafts flying over Ma Wan at different times of the day to illustrate the noise nuisance experienced by the residents and made the following main points :

- (a) in considering whether the 3RS project should be approved, a balance should be struck between the economic development and the general welfare of the local residents;
- (b) the frequency of aircrafts flying pass Ma Wan was high and the aircraft noise was very loud. Although the noise of the arriving aircraft shown in the video was not as loud as that of the departing aircraft, it was still very noisy and comparable to the level of noise generated from the renovation works next door;
- (c) although CPAL had promised to replace their fleets by new aircrafts with quieter engines in future, it could not solve the current noise problems experienced by the residents. Even if there were quieter aircrafts in future, the noise of these aircrafts might still be very disturbing. As the perception of noise was very subjective, he queried whether there was any standard in determining what level of noise was considered unacceptable;
- (d) due to different wind directions over time, the frequency of aircrafts flying over Ma Wan would change, so would the severity of the aircraft noise. While the aircraft noise itself was unbearable, the unpredictability of its occurrence was even more disturbing; and
- (e) supportive views of the 3RS project were mainly on the ground of economic benefits. However, the Board should also consider the general welfare of Ma Wan residents, i.e. the basic right of a quiet

environment and quality sleep according to the provision of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 5,700 households in Ma Wan were adversely affected by the aircraft noise and they had made numerous complaints about aircraft noise to CAD and AAHK. Since nothing had been done to resolve the problem, the 3RS project should not be permitted as it would increase the capacity of HKIA and worsen the aircraft noise problem. The effectiveness of replacing the existing fleets with quieter aircrafts to resolve the noise problem over the next few years was very much in doubt.

R12 – Leung Mei Kuen

58. Mr Ng Chi Wai made the following main points :

- (a) apart from the economic benefits and maintaining the competitiveness of Hong Kong, the Government should also consider the hidden social costs of the 3RS project from the perspective of Ma Wan residents and the general public of Hong Kong;
- (b) there were views saying that the longer we took to decide on 3RS, the more costly it would be due to inflation. That might not be the case as the economy went up and down in a cycle. The construction cost might come down due to the changes in exchange rates and the price of construction materials. Consideration should also be given to the adequate supply of construction labours having regard to the various concurrent infrastructure projects underway;
- (c) unlike other types of noise nuisance, aircraft noise could not be subdued through law enforcement as they flew pass Ma Wan quickly. In fact, the aircraft noise would affect the whole territory as aircrafts had to circle over Hong Kong so as to climb to a designated altitude to cross over to the adjoining airspace controlled by other authority. To maintain HKIA's competitiveness and leading role as an aviation hub, Hong Kong

had to pay a high social cost in terms of air and noise pollution and the provision of medical and health services because of the pollution problem. Those could not be compensated by economic and GDP growth. A balance should be struck between economic development and the livelihood of the Hong Kong residents;

- (d) the financing arrangement of the 3RS project had deviated from the principles of fiscal prudence. The Financial Secretary had turned a blind eye on the 3RS financing arrangement but hold a tight grip on the use of public money in respect of the universal retirement protection plan. The levy under the airport construction fee charging regime might be increased due to the increase in construction cost or the rise in interest rate on the loan. Passengers might choose to use other airports near Hong Kong or XRL if there was a high levy imposed, resulting in a reduction in the number of passengers using HKIA; and
- (e) in view of the airspace issue, it would be more effective to retain the existing 2RS but cooperate with adjoining airports. HKIA should consider the concept of sharing resource in which better services at HKIA should be provided to attract/retain high-end passengers while diverting lower-end passengers to other airports.

R14 – 一批馬灣居民

59. Ms Shirley Wong Hang Wan made the following main points :

- (a) while AAHK and the aviation operators focused on economic growth and maintaining HKIA's leadership in aviation, Ma Wan residents were requesting for their basic right for a quiet environment and the environmentalist for the living right of dolphins. The Board should be independent in considering the 3RS project;

- (b) quoting Bill Bryson, a best-selling writer opposing the 3RS development for the London Heathrow Airport, she agreed with his views that ‘enough is enough’. Bill Bryson argued that building a third runway at London Heathrow Airport to increase its capacity was not what the people wanted and the decision of building the runway was not made by the people. If the capacity of HKIA was saturated, so be it. It was not possible to expand HKIA indefinitely at all cost;
- (c) HKIA should explore the possibility of adjusting the fleet mix in order to increase its capacity for passenger throughput. The economic benefits of 3RS would not be as great as it was anticipated as about half of the passengers were transit passengers and they had no apparent contribution to the economy of Hong Kong;
- (d) the Chief Executive (CE)’s view of having 3 runways was better than two was not correct. Hong Kong was slightly smaller than London in terms of land area and had slightly less population. However, there were 60.8 million visitors (or 32 million visitors after discounting those did not stay overnight) in Hong Kong in 2014 as against 17.4 million visitors in London. We should consider whether our tourism and logistics industries should be expanded relentlessly and the basic rights of Hong Kong residents should be sacrificed;
- (e) in Charles Landry’s writings about creative cities, he suggested alternatives for development. Instead of further expanding the market of tourism which had been saturated, Hong Kong should promote cultural and agricultural activities. Rather than striving for a higher economic growth, we should take more care of our environment and our health; and
- (f) the 3RS project would be detrimental to Hong Kong as more aircrafts would bring more pollution and carbon emission. More land should be zoned for agricultural uses to provide more choices for our food supply instead of forcing Hong Kong people to rely on expensive imported food.

A balanced landuse was important to the eco-system of Hong Kong.
The Board should decide carefully for our future.

C40 – Hong Kong Professionals and Senior Executives Association (HKPSEA)

60. Mr Stephen Chan made the following main points :

- (a) HKPSEA supported the 3RS project and the amendments to the CLK OZP;
- (b) AAHK had proposed nearly 250 mitigation measures in the construction and operational phases of the proposed 3RS and had struck a balance between development and the conservation of marine ecology as far as practicable;
- (c) HKPSEA supported the use of non-dredged deep cement mixing method for reclamation at contaminated mud pits which would prevent the spilling of contaminated mud and hence protect the marine ecology. Also, the designation of the MPs and the mitigation measures for protecting CWD were supported. The air quality, noise level and water quality would be monitored through the environmental monitoring system to ensure that the mitigation measures were implemented effectively;
- (d) putting the south runway on stand-by at night and redirecting flight paths to avoid densely populated areas in the 3RS operation would minimise the impacts on the residents; and
- (e) the 3RS project was required urgently to meet the growing demand for aviation, reinforce HKIA's leading role as an aviation hub, facilitate the economic development and create job opportunities.

61. One of the representatives of the Park Island Owners' Committee indicated that she had not yet made her oral submission. With the consent of the Chairman, Ms Sylvia Lee Siu Fong made the following main points :

- (a) the Board was capable of considering various issues including noise pollution, environmental protection and marine habitats, economic benefits etc as Members were experts in different fields and high-ranking government officials. As the Board's decision on the 3RS project had far reaching implications, careful consideration should be given on all aspects of the development, in particular, the Ma Wan residents' views should be treated in a more humane manner;
- (b) she had lived in Park Island for more than 10 years and made numerous complaints about the aircraft noise problem. However, nothing had been done by EPD or AAHK and what the Ma Wan residents could do was to move away from the area. Apart from the aircraft noise at night, departing aircrafts were also frequent between 7am to 8am and the disturbance was just as bad as that at night. Years ago when she made complaints about aircraft noise, she received replies from AAHK saying that there would be quieter aircrafts with less carbon emission and less pollution, similar to what the representatives of AAHK and airline companies had just mentioned in their presentations. However, the situation had not been improved and hence their so-called target in reducing noise level with modern aircrafts should not be taken seriously. As AAHK and airline companies had vested interest in the 3RS project, their views should not be trusted upon at all;
- (c) the safety operation of 3RS should be carefully considered and the airspace issue should be sorted out to ensure flight safety during landing. She agreed with Mr Lam Chiu Ying (C128) that the Board should not approve anything that would not promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community as stated in the Ordinance;

- (d) the economy of Hong Kong would rely on many aspects other than 3RS. Hasty decision on the vast investment on 3RS might be detrimental to the financial stability of Hong Kong; and
- (e) she hoped Members would adopt a more humane attitude in considering the residents' views in making a decision similar to the attitude taken by the Chairman in allowing the Park Island residents in expressing their views through various means.

62. As the representers, commenters and their representatives had completed their presentations, the Chairman invited questions from Members. He said that Members might direct their questions to the government representatives, the representers, the commenters or their representatives for responses.

Capacity of HKIA

63. The Vice-chairman said that while AAHK had presented statistics on the number of air passengers, the volume of cargo freights, the fleet mix and the annual number of ATMs, and the past trend and forecast on air traffic demand to demonstrate that the capacity of the existing 2RS in HKIA would soon be saturated, it was noted that the capacity of HKIA could be affected by the proportion of LCC flights which mainly used narrow-bodied aircrafts and operated short-haul flights. He asked whether AAHK could provide information on the proportion of LCC flights against flights operated by traditional airlines, the proportion of long-haul and short-haul flights, the proportion of flights to Mainland cities and international cities, and the proportion of flights using a northerly route and southerly route to facilitate consideration of the capacity issue of HKIA.

64. In response, Mr Wilson Fung of AAHK (C1) made the following main points :

Proportion of LCC flights and its growing trend

- (a) AAHK treated LCC and other airlines equally and had no policy to encourage LCC development, e.g. discount on airport charges. The share of LCC flights in terms of seating capacity in Hong Kong grew

from 0.6% in 2004 to 7.9% in 2014, which was lower than the global growth of LCC's share from 10.5% to 26.8% for the same period of time. In terms of ATMs, for the period from 2000 to 2014, the annual compound growth of narrow-bodied and wide-bodied LCC flights in Hong Kong was 10.1% and 3.9% respectively;

Proportion of wide-bodied and narrow-bodied aircrafts

- (b) there was a global trend of using narrow-bodied aircrafts, which were more advanced and more economical. From 2001 to 2015, there were 9,791 orders for new A320 aircrafts as against 317 orders for the super wide-bodied A380. In 2013, out of the total number of aircrafts in service (20,910), 22% was wide-bodied aircrafts and 65% was narrow-bodied aircrafts. Out of the total number of 42,180 aircrafts projected in 2033, 24% would be wide-bodied and 70% would be narrow-bodied aircrafts. There was apparently a faster growth in the market share for narrow-bodied aircrafts. While many flight routes taken up by LCC were served by narrow-bodied aircrafts, the load factor of these flights was high (about 79%) when compared with 73% of that by traditional airlines. A load factor of 79% meant that nearly the flight was full;

Proportions of long/short-haul and Mainland/international flights

- (c) in 2014, the split between long and short-haul flights was about 1:3. Amongst the short-haul flights, 30% was for Mainland cities and 70% for international cities. In terms of number of air passengers, about 20% of the total air passengers in 2004 were taking flights to the Mainland and it rose to 23% in 2014, while the annual compound growth in the number of air passengers was 5.5% for the same period of time.

65. In response to a Member's question on how the capacity of 102 ATMs per hour of 3RS would be reached, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau, DS(T)4, THB said that there would be no need to achieve 102 ATMs per hour right from the beginning of 3RS operation, but the air traffic movements would be built up gradually as demand increased.

Impacts of XRL and HZMB

66. The Vice-chairman said that in previous hearing sessions, it was indicated that about 4% of HKIA's passenger throughput to Mainland cities would potentially be affected by XRL. However, he considered that when XRL was in full operation to serve remote cities with no airports, more existing air passengers would rather take XRL to save the trouble of going through transit at air nodes. He asked whether that had been taken into consideration in assessing the capacity demand of HKIA.

67. In response, Mr Wilson Fung of AAHK (C1) made the following main points:

- (a) in making forecast on the air traffic demand, the MP2030 had assessed the impacts of XRL. Cities with airport services and within a 6-hour travelling distance by rail had been assessed in the MP2030 and it was revealed that 4% of the air passengers might choose to take XRL, which was equivalent to about 4% of ATMs. References had also been made to international cities with both air and rail services and it was discovered that the shorter the travelling time, the more likely it was for passengers to travel by rail;
- (b) MP2030 had also studied whether XRL would have synergy effect and brought in more air passengers. From examples in France, Japan and Spain, there was positive induction effect and the number of air passengers in various airports had been increased by 8% to 150%. In view of the great variation, assumptions on the induction effect for HKIA was not taken on board and no revision to the potential passenger throughput to be affected by XRL was considered necessary; and
- (c) apart from XRL, it was necessary to take into account the economic growth to be brought about by the HZMB project. It was expected that the HZMB project would bring an additional of 4 million air passengers per annum to HKIA in 2030.

Aircraft noise Issue

68. Noting that many Ma Wan residents had complained about the aircraft noise and apparently nothing could be done to solve their problems, the Vice-chairman asked whether there was any mechanism to deal with aircraft noise complaints, and whether any mitigation measures were proposed in the EIA on aircraft noise issue to ensure that the cumulative noise impact of the 3RS project would not worsen the current situation.

69. In response, Mr Wilson Fung of AAHK (C1) made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), residential development or any development that was sensitive to noise nuisance would not be permitted in areas covered by the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) 25 contour. That standard was comparable to those adopted by other major worldwide airports and was more stringent than the NEF 30 contour adopted when Kai Tak Airport was in use;
- (b) in the EIA for the 3RS project, the year 2011 was taken as the baseline condition and 2030 was taken as the worst case scenario for noise assessment. NEF contours were calculated in accordance with the model designed by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). As shown on a plan extracted from the EIA report, the NEF 25 contour had affected some villages in the northern part of Lantau, but it was found in the subsequent surveys that a number of the village houses were unoccupied or ruined. About 50% of the affected population was concentrated in Sha Lo Wan and San Shek Wan.

70. At this juncture, some Ma Wan residents and Mr Tam Hoi Pong (C131) said that Mr Fung's response was biased as he represented AAHK. The Chairman explained that Mr Fung was answering the questions raised by the Vice-chairman and the Q&A session was not for the debate between different parties. He requested Mr Tam and Ma Wan residents to

respect other commenters when they were expressing their views and they would have the opportunity to speak when the questions from Members were directed to them.

71. Mr Wilson Fung of AAHK (C1) continued to make the following points:

- (a) while developments within NEF 25 contour would be affected, area outside that contour would also be subject to noise impact. AAHK and CAD had taken measures to minimise aircraft noise nuisance, including :
 - (i) since February 2012, a new technology was adopted to ensure that aircrafts installed with suitable equipment could align more accurately with the centre line of the flight path to minimise their noise impact on the adjacent area due to flying off-course;
 - (ii) since October 2014, aircrafts which marginally met the noise standard of Chapter 3 set down by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) were prohibited from flying at HKIA; and
 - (iii) since March 2014, the number of night-time ATMs was capped to 230 flights and no new application for take-off/landing would be approved to ensure that noise impact on noise sensitive receivers would not be worsened;

[Mr H.F. Leung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (b) since the implementation of the above measures, there was improvement to the noise nuisance problem in that while the number of aircrafts flying over Ma Wan had increased from 28,647 in 2011 to 34,254 in 2014, the number of aircrafts with noise level of 70dB(A) or above (as recorded by the noise monitoring terminal located at Ma Wan) had decreased from 9,162 to 6,964. For aircrafts with noise level of 80dB(A) or above, the number had decreased from 204 to 94 in the same period;

- (c) AAHK was examining the feasibility of levying environmental charges to provide incentives for airlines to upgrade their fleets with quieter engines. The study was nearly completed and the aviation operators would be consulted for implementation as soon as possible; and
- (d) as routine maintenance was required for the existing runways, the runways would be used alternatively during the maintenance period. When using the south runway, it would have worse noise impact on the surrounding areas. If the 3RS project was implemented, the south runway would be designated as a stand-by runway during night-time operation and that would help to alleviate the noise nuisance.

72. At this juncture, Mr Tam Hoi Pong said that Mr Fung's presentation in response to the Member's query had effectively prolonged his presentation time and requested that the same be applicable to other commenters. The Chairman said that Mr Tam would have his chance to answer questions if questions from Members were directed to him. The Chairman asked Mr Tam to respect other commenters when they were answering Members' questions.

73. Mr Wilson Fung of AAHK (C1) continued to make the following main points:

- (a) the designation of the south runway as a stand-by runway was proposed as a noise mitigation measure in the EIA and included as a condition in the EP. As such, it would be implemented as a requirement under the EP. As it was necessary to consider the impact of HKIA on Hong Kong as a whole, aircrafts would avoid flying over densely populated areas at night (from 23:00 to 07:00). Flights taking-off in eastward direction would avoid flying north over Tai Lam and Siu Lam at night. Similarly, in-coming flights in the westward direction would take Track 6 from the south, making a left turn before reaching Ma Wan for landing to avoid flying over Sha Tin to reduce the overall noise impact;

- (b) there were nearly the same number of aircrafts landing and taking off at daytime. However, the number of departing and arriving aircrafts varied during night time. More aircrafts (e.g. cargo freights) would take-off during 23:00 to 05:00 and more aircrafts (long-haul flights arriving to pick-up passengers for early departure) would land during 05:00 to 07:00. At present, an average of 85-90% of aircrafts would take an easterly flying route and about 10-15% a westerly route throughout the day due to the prevailing wind direction. With the 3RS, a 'tidal operation' would be adopted, pending the number of arriving and departing aircrafts. Attempt would be made to lower the proportion of eastward flying aircrafts to 55% (or 45% westward flying) from 23:00 to 05:00 during which there would be more departing aircrafts and 90% landing toward the east from 05:00 to 07:00 during which there would be more arriving aircrafts, subject to wind condition and safety consideration; and
- (c) with the above arrangement, the NEF 25 contour for 2030 and 2032 would shift northward correspondingly. In the NEF calculation, a factor of 16 had been applied to night time aircraft noise in view of quieter ambient noise level at night. Under 3RS, with the designation of the south runway as a standby runway during night time, the noise factor for the middle and north runways would be higher, resulting a northward shifting of the NEF contour. The northward shifting of the NEF 25 contour as simulated in the EIA indicated that there would be an improvement in aircraft noise issue in Tung Chung and marginal improvement in Ma Wan. Under the conditions of the EP, AAHK was required to carry out environmental monitoring and audit to verify the statistics on noise and operational conditions, review the NEF 25 contour every 5 years and liaise with stakeholders on the aircraft noise issue.

74. The Vice-chairman asked since the number of noisy aircraft flying over Ma Wan had decreased in the period from 2011 to 2014, whether such improvement was reflected by a corresponding reduction in the number of aircraft noise complaints.

75. In response, Mr Raymond C.O. Ng, CSO(A&SR), CAD made the following main points:

- (a) members of the public could make enquiries or lodge complaints with CAD regarding aircraft noise by phone, in writing by fax or email. CAD would process such enquiries/complaints according to the established procedures, i.e. an interim reply within 10 days if a substantial reply could not be provided and a substantive reply within 30 days from the date of the receipt of the enquiry/complaint. While the statistics on aircraft noise enquiry/complaint in 2015 was still being compiled, there were about 200 aircraft noise complaints in 2014; and
- (b) according to international standards, aircrafts noise performance was classified with reference to the noise standards adopted by ICAO and set out in its Annex 16 to the Convention on International Civil Aviation, rather than the noise levels measured in dB(A) by noise monitoring terminal. CAD had already prohibited the operations of aircraft which marginally complied with the noise standards in ICAO Annex 16 Chapter 3. In investigating the noise complaints received by CAD, CAD would focus on whether the aircraft under complaint complied with the above requirements.

76. Making reference to Mr Wilson Fung of AAHK (C1)'s presentation on mitigation measures to alleviate the aircraft noise problem in Ma Wan and the statistics of noisy aircrafts flying pass Ma Wan, a Member asked whether such measures would ease Ma Wan residents' concern on the aircraft noise issue.

77. In response, Mr Tam Hoi Pong said that with 3RS, the aircraft noise problem at Ma Wan would depend on whether aircrafts were allowed to fly north directly. Without resolving the airspace issue, aircrafts would still need to fly pass Ma Wan. The increased number of flights upon 3RS operation would definitely have a greater impact on the Ma Wan

residents. He also pointed out that if aircrafts were allowed to fly north directly, residents in Tai Lam, Siu Lam and Tsing Lung Tau would then be affected.

78. Mr Ng Chi Wai (R12) supplemented the following main points:

- (a) He doubted the accuracy of the diagrams prepared by AAHK as the flight path of an aircraft could make a 90 degree turn;
- (b) He asked why Ma Wan was not covered by the NEF 25 contour as it was severely affected by aircraft noise;
- (c) He considered Mr Fung's argument that if the 3RS project was not implemented, the mountains in Lantau would need to be removed to increase the capacity of 2RS was a threat and should not be considered; and
- (d) he doubted whether 3RS would really bring economic benefits to Hong Kong.

79. Mr Lun Chi Wai (R9) supplemented the following main points :

- (a) even though there was a reduction in the number of noisy aircrafts flying over Ma Wan, the improvement was not good enough as Ma Wan residents were still subject to aircraft noise throughout the night, only less frequently;
- (b) he doubted the accuracy of the NEF contour diagram as he had spotted some aircrafts flying above Tin Liu New Village in Ma Wan, which was located near the edge of the NEF 25 contour; and
- (c) as Ma Wan was severely affected by aircraft noise, it should be covered by NEF 25 contour. Even if Ma Wan was located outside NEF 25 contour,

it was subject to severe noise nuisance. As nothing could be done to address the issue, NEF contour was meaningless.

80. Noting that the south runway would be used for standby at night-time when 3RS was in operation according to AAHK, another Member asked about the noise condition at day-time when the south runway was also in operation. In response, Mr Wilson Fung of AAHK (C1) said that the NEF contour was a contour line showing places of equal noise exposure, taking into account the noise level of all aircrafts in a year. Due to a lower ambient noise background at night, the same noise level would be perceived as louder. In calculating the NEF, a conservative approach was already taken by applying a multiplication factor of 16 to the noise level at night time.

Airspace/air traffic control issue

81. The Chairman asked whether the above aircraft noise mitigation measures would require corresponding adjustment to the existing airspace restrictions and what the capacity of HKIA would be with 3RS, assuming no change to the existing airspace restrictions.

82. In response, Mr Wilson Fung of AAHK (C1) said that the issues of flight path planning, airspace design and management were the responsibility of CAD. However, the feasibility of the 3RS project was based on designated flight paths and forecast on air traffic volume, which were accepted by CAD. Those designated flight paths included the north flight routes.

83. Mr Wallace K.K. Lau (DS(T)4, THB) supplemented that in 2007, the government had formulated and agreed to a Pearl River Delta Region Air Traffic Management, Planning and Implementation Plan (Version 2.0) (the 2007 Plan) together with the civil aviation authorities of the Mainland and Macau. The flight paths covered in the EIA and in Mr Fung's presentation were included in the 2007 Plan. It was expected that the capacity of HKIA under 3RS could reach 102 ATMs per hour with the implementation of enhancement measures in the 2007 Plan. There was no information on the capacity of HKIA with 3RS if the existing airspace utilisations remained the same, but it would be covered by an on-going assessment.

84. A Member requested the representatives of AAHK or CAD to elaborate on the issue of airspace and confirm whether 102 ATMs of 3RS was based on the assumption that aircrafts could fly north or northeast directly without any restriction. The Member also asked whether the on-going assessment, mentioned by Mr Lau implied that the northward flight path was in fact restricted.

85. In response, Mr Wallace K.K. Lau (DS(T)4, THB) said that in planning for an important infrastructure project such as the 3RS project, all possibilities should be taken into consideration. The 3RS project was planned in accordance with the 2007 Plan as agreed by the civil aviation authorities of Hong Kong, Macau and Mainland. The capacity of HKIA with 3RS could reach 102 ATMs per hour progressively based on demand. The on-going assessment on the northward flight path was only a scenario for assessing the feasibility/capacity of 3RS and did not imply that the 2007 Plan was not agreed by the relevant authorities in the Mainland. CAD had actually already implemented measures contained in the 2007 Plan including the recent addition of a new flight route to ease the congested air traffic condition between Hong Kong and the eastern part of Mainland.

[Mr K.F. Tang left this session of the meeting at this point.]

86. At this juncture, Mr Tam Hoi Pong raised his disagreement with Mr Lau's reply. In response, the Chairman reiterated that the Q&A session was for Members to direct questions to the relevant parties and not for debate among different parties.

87. Regarding the question on flight paths, Mr Samuel Ng (SEVO(1), CAD made the following main points :

- (a) the existing 2RS of HKIA was operated under an 'Independent Segregated Mode' and could achieve a maximum capacity of 68 ATMs per hour, which was the maximum practical capacity according to the latest consultancy study and it was mainly due to the constraints imposed by the topography of Lantau and the longitudinal separation requirement between aircrafts due to wake turbulence;

- (b) if the 2RS was to operate under a fully independent mixed mode to increase the capacity of HKIA, ICAO's safety requirements had to be met, i.e. able to turn an aircraft away to avoid colliding into another aircraft on a parallel flight path that went off-course. HKIA could only meet this requirement by cutting off most of the high peaks on Lantau Island, which was considered impractical;
- (c) a flying aircraft would create wake turbulence, which took some time to disperse. ICAO had laid down specific longitudinal separation requirement between aircraft with different weight categories. The heavier the aircraft, the stronger the wake turbulence, hence a larger longitudinal separation between aircrafts was required in accordance with ICAO's safety requirements. For safety reason, the separation distance between aircrafts needed to be strictly followed; and
- (d) 'Transfer of Control Point', a commonly adopted air traffic management arrangement between airspaces controlled by different air traffic control units, was misinterpreted by some representers and commenters as the so-called "air wall". In fact there was no wall-type segregation between different airspaces. The arrangement to hand over control of an aircraft to another air traffic control unit at a specific altitude and geographical location was to ensure that aircrafts in adjacent airspaces could fly concurrently in a safe and efficient manner.

88. In replying to a Member's follow-up question on whether there was any restriction on aircrafts flying northward under the 'Transfer of Control Point' arrangement, Mr Ng said that Hong Kong had adopted the above arrangement with all adjoining air traffic control units which were subject to specific requirements in terms of the location and altitude for transfer of control.

Environmental issue

89. Another Member said that in a previous hearing session, Dr Samuel Hung of HKCDS suggested that a marine traffic impact (MTIA) should be conducted for the water area to the south of Lantau for better protection of the marine habitat of CWD at Fan Lau and Soko Islands. However, a government representative replied in that same session that high-speed ferries running along the south Lantau coast was not related to ferry services at the SkyPier, hence the MTIA of the 3RS project had not included the waters of south Lantau. That Member asked whether a MTIA for the waters near south Lantau would be carried out by AAHK, and if not, what were the reasons.

90. In response, Mr Tommy Leung of AAHK (C1) said that according to Dr Hung, the high-speed ferries commuting between Hong Kong to Macau and Zhuhai would run along south Lantau Coast and affect the habitat of CWD at Fan Lau and Soko Islands. It was requested by Dr Hung that the relevant party should examine whether it was feasible to shift the ferry routes southward to minimise the impacts on CWD. Mr Leung further said that the ferry routes running along south Lantau Coast had been in use for more than several decades and were not related to the ferry services of the SkyPier. The EIA of the 3RS project had considered that given the sea condition to the further south of Lantau, the shifting of ferry routes further south might have safety implications. Besides, Dr Hung's proposal was considered not relevant to the 3RS project as the ferry routes concerned were not from the SkyPier or in connection with the operation of HKIA, and AAHK had no jurisdiction over those high-speed ferry operations.

91. The Chairman asked whether there would be any study regarding the arrangement for the high-speed ferry routes to the south of Lantau. In response, Mr Tony T.F. Li, SMO/P&D(3), MD said that any new high speed ferry route should be proposed by the ferry operators to MD for assessment and acceptance, which would then be specified in the Permit to Operate High Speed Craft. Mr Dick K.C. Choi, SMCO(W), AFCD supplemented that AFCD had been monitoring the number of CWD and examining factors that would have led to their reduction in number and marine traffic of high speed ferries was identified as one possible factor. It was a requirement in the EIA of the 3RS project to

examine the impacts of high-speed ferry routes on CWD and the study brief of the EIA had not restricted the study to ferry routes related to the SkyPier only.

92. As Members did not have any further questions and the representers, commenters and their representatives had nothing to add, the Chairman said that the hearing procedure on the day had been completed. He thanked the representers, commenters and their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would deliberate the representations in their absence after completing all the hearing sessions and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. They all left the meeting at this point.

93. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 8:16 p.m.