

Minutes of the 49th POC Meeting

Date: 27 January 2006 (Friday)

Time: 1000 hours

Venue: Conference Room A, 24/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central

Present	Mr. S. Y. TSUI	Chairman
	Mr. Albert WONG	HK Cargo-Vessel Trader Association
	Mr. Harry LAM	HK Container Terminal Operators Association
	Mr. Terence SIT	HK General Chamber of Commerce
	Mr. Peter NG	HK Liner Shipping Association
	(On behalf of Mr. Neil RUSSELL)	
	Mr. S.H. PAU	HK Pilots Association
	Mr. T.K. CHEUNG	Local Ferry Operators
	(On behalf of Mr. K.T. KWOK)	
	Mr. C.M. KU	Oil Industry
	Mr. Terence TSE	Wharf and Godown Operators
	Mr. K.M. FUNG	Economic Development and Labour Bureau
	(On behalf of Ms Janice TSE)	
	Mr. K.M. LEE	Marine Department
	Mr. Frankie LAM	Secretary
In Attendance	Mr. Roger TUPPER	Marine Department

Presenter of POC Paper No. 1/06 :

Mr. C.H. CHEUNG	Highways Department
Dr. Sam WONG	Highways Department
Mr. Alex KONG	Arup (Consultant)
Mr. Samuel KWAN	Arup (Consultant)
Mr. Richard COLWILL	BMT (Consultant)
Mr. Ronald YIP	BMT (Consultant)
Mr. Tony LI	Marine Department

Presenter of POC Paper No. 2/06:

Dr. Tina **CHAN** Department of Health
Dr. T.C. **SHIU** Department of Health

Apologies Mr. P.Y. **LI** Dockyard Operators
Mr. Y.S. **YOUNG** HK Ship Owners Association
Mr. Sunny **HO** HK Shippers' Council
Mr. W.L. **LAU** Civil Engineering and Development
Department

1. **Open of Meeting**

1.1 **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) welcomed all to the meeting.

1.2 **Mr. TSUI** introduced the following new comers to the meeting : -

1.2.1 **Mr. Peter NG** acted on behalf of **Mr. Neil RUSSELL** and **Mr. NG** had been nominated as the POC member representing the HK liner Shipping Association for the next term of office.

1.2.2 **Mr. T.K. CHEUNG** acted on behalf of **Mr. K.T. KWOK** and **Mr. CHEUNG** had been nominated as the POC member representing Local Ferry Operators for the next term of office.

1.2.3 **Mr. Frankie LAM** replaced **Mr. K.K. LAU** as Secretary of the POC.

2. **Appreciation to Current and Step-down Members**

Mr. S.Y. TSUI (Chairman) said that the current term of office of the POC would end on 14 February 2006, he would like to thank the current and step-down members for their contribution to the POC. The step-down members were: -

Mr. P.Y. LI
Mr. Terence SIT
Mr. N. RUSSELL
Mr. Y.S. YOUNG
Mr. K.T. KWOK

3. **Confirmation of Minutes of the Last Meeting**

3.1 Amendments were received as follows : -

3.1.1 The whole paragraph of 2.2.3 would be re-written as '**Mr. Peter NG** (Member) said these amendments had come into force internationally, it would be appropriate to update the local legislation too. **Mr. Roger TUPPER** (Co-chairman) thanked **Mr. NG** for his support.'

3.1.2 A new paragraph 2.2.4 would be added : 'The paper was thus endorsed.'

4. New Items

4.1 POC Paper No. 1/06

Hong Kong Section of Hong Kong – Zhuhai – Macao Bridge (HZMB) and North Lantau Highway Connection (NLHC)

4.1.1 **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) invited the representatives from the Highways Department and the consultants to present the paper.

4.1.2 **Mr. C.H. CHEUNG** (Highways Department) briefed members on the background of the HZMB project. He said that the feasibility study of the HZMB was being undertaken by a mainland consultant and the northern bridge-cum-tunnel alignment, landing in northwest Lantau near San Shek Wan headland of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) on the east and in Gongbei of Zhuhai and A Pérola of the Macao Special Administrative Region on the west, was agreed among the three governments. He also said that in parallel with the HZMB feasibility study, the HKSAR Government appointed a consultant in March 2004 to undertake an investigation and preliminary design (I&PD) study for the Hong Kong Section of the HZMB and NLHC, and various alignment options had been investigated in the I&PD study for connecting the HZMB to the existing road network. He then asked the consultants to present the paper in detail.

4.1.3 **Mr. Alex KONG** (Arup) added that for the Western Section of the NLHC, the recommended viaduct alignment running along the Airport Channel and landing at the southern side of the Airport Island beyond the Government Flying Service (GFS) Headquarters. Such alignment, which would avoid affecting the normal operations of the airport and the helicopters of GFS, was generally supported during public

consultations. He also said that for the Eastern Section of NLHC, two alignment options were short-listed for further consideration after a series of public consultations. They were a viaduct option running seaward side of Tung Chung and a tunnel option running hillside at the back of Tung Chung. He then invited BMT (a sub-consultant for Arup) to present the proposed navigation bridge spans and marine impacts associated with the proposed alignment options.

Presentation made by Mr. Richard COLWILL(BMT)

4.1.4 **Mr. Richard COLWILL** (BMT) explained the navigation contexts in the area which mainly included ferries going to and from Tung Chung and working craft involved in construction works at Tung Chung.

4.1.5 Western Side of Airport Island

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that the bridge span for the navigation channel at the western side of the Airport Island was proposed to have a twin 150m spans to provide a clear navigable width of two 100m one-way shipping channel under the bridge. The twin spans would be separated by a third 150m span in the middle. Taking into consideration the airport height restrictions (AHR) and subject to the exact alignment of the Zhujiang section of the HZMB being studied, a minimum of 41m of net navigable height during high tide would be provided which would cater for the local marine traffic using the area.

4.1.6 Airport Channel

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that the bridge crossing the airport channel was constrained by the alignment skewness and the AHR. A bridge with span length of 180m was proposed which gave a net navigable width of 46m and height of 10.55m during high tide. Various stakeholders who were allowed to use this sea channel had been consulted and the proposed navigation width and height were considered acceptable.

Eastern Side of the Airport Island

4.1.7 Sea Viaduct Option

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that this portion of the NLHC would cross the existing navigation channel at the eastern side of the Airport Island. A bridge span of 200m was proposed which gave a net navigable width of 100m and height of 21.3m during high tide which would be sufficient for two-way marine traffic for regular users of this

channel and the construction barges. Adjacent to the proposed navigation span for the existing channel, another bridge span with same net navigable width and height would also be provided as a future navigation channel, in view of the possible blockage of the existing navigation channel by the proposed future reclamation at Tung Chung East.

4.1.8 Land Tunnel Option

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that this portion of the NLHC would be a land tunnel running at the back of Tung Chung and would have no impact on the navigation channel at the eastern side of the Airport Island. A viaduct with spans of which the navigable width and height not less than the three existing bridges crossing the Airport Channel from the Airport Island to Tung Chung was proposed from Pak Sha Tsui to Wong Nai Uk.

(Post-meeting note: The second sentence in para 9 of POC Paper No. 1/06 i.e. “However, since...and minimum bridge soffit level of +12.8 mPD...” should be amended to read “However, since...and minimum bridge soffit level of +12.95 mPD...”, and the revised Figure 6 of the Paper is attached)

Assessment of Navigation Safety

4.1.9 **Mr. Richard COLWILL** (BMT) said that the navigation safety with respect to the proposed spans mentioned above had been examined by simulations using a Full Mission Ship Simulator in Marine Department’s Training Centre. Experienced pilots of river-trade, fast ferry and Fire Services Department vessels had participated in the simulation to transit the proposed navigation spans. The key conclusions were: -

4.1.10 Navigation Span at Western Side of the Airport Island

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that the arrangement of bridge piers, spans and navigational aids were suitable for masters to observe on-coming traffic and were adequately aligned for the bridge passage for safe transit.

4.1.11 Navigation Span at the Airport Channel

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that although two-way passage for smaller vessels was feasible and safe, the channel width, bridge angle and width associated with the site environment only allowed provision of one-way access for larger vessels like barges.

4.1.12 Navigation Span at Eastern Side of the Airport Island (for Sea Viaduct Option)

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that the span was considered wide enough for two vessels to transit simultaneously. The bridge piers were located at the present edges of the dredged channels and the alignment of the existing navigable channel would not be changed with the proposed NLHC.

4.1.13 Viaduct Span across the Airport Channel (for Land Tunnel Option)

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that navigation simulation had not been conducted for these viaduct spans. However, as compared with the existing bridges crossing the channel, the proposed viaduct spans were considered wide and high enough for existing vessels using the channel.

Marine Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures

4.1.14 Radar System Impact

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that an additional radar would be installed near the navigation span at the western side of the Airport Island to compensate for the anticipated interference of the proposed bridge on Marine Department's existing radar facilities at Black Point.

4.1.15 Construction Issues

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that construction of the HZMB would be largely a marine supported offshore operation involving work barge traffic. As most of the marine construction activities occurred in lightly trafficked areas, the impact was anticipated to be low. Within the Airport Channel and eastern side of the Airport Island, the existing marine traffic was very light, impact of the construction works on marine traffic was anticipated to be low also.

4.1.16 Ship Impact Protection

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that the area adjacent to the viaduct of the Hong Kong Section of HZMB and NLHC would be designated as a restricted area for vessels above a specific air-draft limit which might pose hazard to the bridge deck. Ship impact protection would be designed to limit load transfer to the bridge and damage to the ships.

4.1.17 Ongoing Assessments

Mr. Richard COLWILL (BMT) said that ongoing analysis was

being conducted to establish operational requirements for the traffic control system and risk assessment of the marine traffic environment. This included a marine construction risk and navigation control assessment to develop diversion planning of marine traffic flows and the requirements for one-way or two-way navigation control and a dynamic traffic simulation to test the future traffic regime.

- 4.1.18 **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) invited comments from the floor on the navigable clearances under the bridge spans.
- 4.1.19 **Mr. T.K. CHEUNG** (Member) enquired about the maximum size of vessel that could pass below the navigation bridge span at the western side of the Airport Island. **Mr. Richard COLWILL** (BMT) responded that vessels of maximum 60m length overall should be able to pass underneath. He also said that currently there were seven barges in Hong Kong that could not pass and these barges had to navigate round the southeastern corner of Lantau.
- 4.1.20 **Mr. S.H. PAU** (Member) said that as the bridge spans were to be built at shallow water channel, ocean-going vessels would not be affected.
- 4.1.21 **Mr. K.M. LEE** (Marine Department) enquired in respect of the compensation of radar site, whether **Mr. Derek LEE** of VTC had been consulted, **Mr. Tony LI** (Marine Department) responded in the affirmative that VTC had been consulted and no adverse comments were received. **Mr. K.M. LEE** said that the compensation radar site would be located at an appropriate location.
- 4.1.22 **Mr. Peter NG** (Member) enquired whether the design of the HZMB had been fixed in the form of tunnel in the middle with bridges at both ends for the section between Hong Kong and Zhuhai and **Mr. C.H. CHEUNG** (Highways Department) responded that whilst the HZMB feasibility study report was being considered by the three Governments, the preferred alignment would adopt a bridge-cum-tunnel arrangement. **Mr. Richard COLWILL** (BMT) supplemented that the choice of tunnel/bridge options would also take consideration of the depth of water and topography of the seabed of the concerned areas.
- 4.1.23 **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) enquired whether there was any time table for getting the green light for the HZMB project and **Mr. C.H. CHEUNG** (Highways Department) responded that the three

Governments were deliberating the findings of the feasibility study , and would map out the actions that should be taken in the next stage of work upon approval of the feasibility study report by the Central Government.

- 4.1.24 **Mr. Roger TUPPER** (Marine Department) enquired about the current magnitude of water current in the sea channel between the Airport Island and Tung Chung and **Mr. Richard COLWILL** (BMT) responded that the water current there was little which was about half knot or less throughout the year.
- 4.1.25 **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) enquired what had been done about the Environmental Impact Assessment and **Mr. Alex KONG (Arup)** responded that plenty works had been done but not yet finalized pending on the final choice of alignment option.
- 4.1.26 **Mr. Roger TUPPER** (Marine Department) enquired whether there was any recommended alignment option for the eastern side of the Airport Island and **Mr. Alex KONG** (Arup) responded that no decision had yet been reached on the preferred alignment option as both the sea viaduct option and the land tunnel option had their merits and demerits. **Mr. TUPPER** further said that the land tunnel option would be the preferred option from navigation and marine traffic impact points of view. **Dr. Sam WONG** (Highways Department) supplemented that consultation was ongoing and the feedback received so far indicated that the majority favoured the land tunnel option.
- 4.1.27 **Mr. Tony LI** (Marine Department) said these alignment options proposal would be put up to the Provisional Local Vessels Advisory Committee to consult the local industry especially for the clearances of the bridge spans.
- 4.1.28 **Mr. Peter NG** (Member) enquired about the deadline to give feedback to the POC and **Dr. Sam WONG** (Highways Department) responded that they would appreciate the feedback to be made available by the end of February 2006.

(Post-meeting note: **Mr. NG** advised on 21 March 2006 that there was no negative feedback on the proposal from the HK Liner Shipping Association.)

- 4.1.29 **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) thanked for the input of the presentation

team and members.

**4.2 POC Paper No. 2/06
Revision of Fees and Charges Quarantine and Prevention of
Diseases Ordinance Chapter 141**

4.2.1 **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) invited the representatives from the Department of Health to present the paper.

Presentation made by Dr. T.C. SHIU (Department of Health)

4.2.2 **Dr. T.C. SHIU** (Department of Health) said that the Port Health Office exercised power vested by the Quarantine and Prevention of Diseases Ordinance (Chapter 141) to carrying out certain measures to prevent the introduction of serious infectious diseases and quarantinable diseases into Hong Kong. One of these measures was to monitor and supervise the sanitary and hygiene condition of ocean-going vessels arriving in the waters of Hong Kong. Ship masters had to produce a valid Deratting Certificate (DC) or Deratting Exemption Certificate (DEC) when applying for a free pratique. He further explained that if a ship applied for the renewal of DEC or DC upon paying the fee and on inspection was found to be free of rodents, a DEC would be issued which would be valid for 6 months.

4.2.3 **Dr. T.C. SHIU** (Department of Health) said that the fees and charges for the issue of DEC were subject to periodical review in accordance with present Government policy with the objective of recovering the full cost of providing the services. These fees and charges were last revised in 1996. Based on the results of a recent costing review exercise, the Government had proposed to make fee adjustments for issuing certificates including those related to shipping industry. The fee for the issue of a DEC was proposed to increase from \$1,940 to \$2,130. The fees for the issue of DC and Bill of Health were proposed to remain unchanged. The shipping industry was invited to express their views on the proposed fees and charges of DEC, DC and Bill of Health upon which the outcome would be put forward to the Health and Welfare Bureau for consideration.

4.2.4 **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) invited comments from the floor on the proposal.

4.2.5 **Mr. Terence SIT** (Member) enquired what the differences were between DC and DEC and **Dr. T.C. SHIU** (Department of Health)

responded that before an ocean-going vessel arrived, the agent might apply for a DEC . When the vessel arrived in Hong Kong, port health inspector(s) would inspect the vessel; if found satisfied, a DEC would be issued. If not, the port health inspector(s) would arrange relevant parties to do fumigation, rodent killing/clearing and upon completion, a DC would be issued. **Mr. Roger TUPPER** (Marine Department) said that the difference in the costs of a DEC and DC would likely be calculated on the manpower and resources deployed. **Dr. SHIU** shared with his views.

4.2.6 **Mr. Terence SIT** (Member) enquired and **Dr. T.C. SHIU** (Department of Health) responded that over 300 DECs were issued in 2005 and the last DC issued was in 1999.

4.2.7 **Mr. Peter NG** (Member) said he heard that for the DC issued in 1999, inspection was done during office hours only which would deter ship owner to do DC inspection in Hong Kong. He requested whether a DC inspection could be done after office hours as well. **Dr. Tina CHAN** (Department of Health) responded that DC inspection followed by fumigation took a whole day. Moreover, inspection under daylight would be better.

4.2.8 **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) said that the endorsed fees and charges would be gazetted.

4.2.9 **Mr. Peter NG** (Member) enquired about the deadline to give the feedback to the POC and **Dr. T.C. SHIU** (Department of Health) responded that he would like to have the feedback by the end of February 2006.

(Post-meeting note: **Mr. NG** advised **Dr. SHIU** on 28 February 2006 that no objection from the members of the Hong Kong Liner Shipping Association was received.)

4.2.10 **Mr. K.M. LEE** (Member) enquired for the reasons of the six month validity of DEC and DC in comparison with one year validity of most certificates possessed by an ocean-going vessel and **Dr. T.C. SHIU** (Department of Health) responded that he supposed the International Health Regulations had taken balance of various factors and that the health and sanitary conditions onboard a ship might vary in a short period. **Dr. Tina CHAN** (Department of Health) supplemented that certificates issued by Hong Kong Port Health Office were recognized internationally.

4.2.11 **Mr. Terence TSE** (Member) enquired why the charges for DC and Bill of Health remained unchanged and **Dr. T.C. SHIU** (Department of Health) responded that application of these certificates were quite rare (last in 1999). The Bill of Health was only required by some specified ports to certify the health status of the crew.

4.2.12 **Mr. K.M. FUNG** (Economic Development and Labour Bureau) enquired whether there were any comparative figures of the charges of these certificates with other ports and **Dr. T.C. SHIU** (Department of Health) responded that relevant statistics were not available.

5 Any Other Business

5.1 **Mr. C.M. KU** (Member) enquired whether the port back-up/logistics development site at South Tsing Yi between Mobil and Esso Oil Terminals had been discussed by the POC and **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) responded that the Pilotage Advisory Committee (PAC) had endorsed the proposal in which the representative from the 'Oil Industry' had offered their views. The POC Paper No. 9/05 on this matter had been circulated to POC members. **Mr. Roger TUPPER** (Marine Department) supplemented that land allocation issues and views on the marine impacts had been adequately discussed in the PAC.

5.2 **Mr. C.M. KU** (Member) enquired how the daily number of vessel movements using the site be monitored and **Mr. Roger TUPPER** (Marine Department) responded that these would be bound by the land lease conditions. **Mr. KU** enquired in case the daily number of vessel movements using the site was found exceeded, which would be the party to be informed and **Mr. S.Y. TSUI** (Chairman) together with **Mr. TUPPER** responded that the Lands Department would have to be informed.

6 Next Term of Office of the POC

Mr. S.Y. TSUI (Chairman) advised that the next term of office of the POC would begin on 15 February 2006 till 14 February 2008 and once again he thanked the current and step-down members for their contribution to the POC.

7 Date of Next Meeting

The date of the next meeting would be advised in due course.

8. Close of Meeting

The meeting closed at 1130 hours.