

**Confirmed Minutes of the 273<sup>rd</sup> Meeting  
of the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE)  
on 9 March 2026 at 2:30 p.m.**

**Present:**

Prof John CHAI, SBS, JP (Chairman)  
Prof Kenneth LEUNG, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Mr CHEUNG Chi-wah  
Ms Ada FUNG, BBS  
Mr Eric HO  
Ms Linda HO  
Mr Alex KWAN  
Ms Grace KWOK  
Dr Theresa KWONG  
Prof Alexis LAU, JP  
Prof Dennis LEUNG  
Mr Daryl NG, SBS, JP  
Mr Simon NG  
Prof QIU Jian-wen  
Mr Albert SU, MH, JP  
Prof WONG Kam-bo  
Mr Jonathan WU  
Dr Raymond YAU  
Dr William YU  
Ms Fabia TAM (Secretary)

**In Attendance:**

*Environment and Ecology Bureau (EEB)*

Miss Mavis HUI	Chief Information Officer
Ms Karen CHEK	Chief Executive Officer (CBD)
Ms Cynthia LAU	Executive Officer (CBD) 1
Miss Glory CHONG	Executive Officer (CBD) 2

*Environmental Protection Department (EPD)*

Dr Samuel CHUI, JP	Director of Environmental Protection (DEP)
Mr Gary TAM	Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

*Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)*

Mr Simon CHAN	Assistant Director (Conservation)
---------------	-----------------------------------

*Planning Department (PlanD)*

Ms Johanna CHENG      Assistant Director of Planning / Technical Services

**In Attendance for Item 3:**

*EPD*

Ms Marlene HO            Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South)  
Ms Hyde MAK             Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North) 3  
Mr Chris WONG          Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North) 34

Project Proponent Team

*Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)*

Ms Joyce LAU, JP        Project Manager (North)  
Mr Peter POON          Chief Engineer / North 2  
Mr CHOW Sui-ping      Chief Engineer / North 4  
Ms Kaberlina HO       Senior Engineer / 7 (North)  
Mr William WONG      Senior Engineer / 21 (North)

Project Consultants

*AECOM - Halcrow Joint Venture*

Mr Freeman CHEUNG    Senior Vice President, Environment, Hong Kong  
Ms LAM Tsz-yau        Senior Environmental Consultant

*Arup - Binnies Joint Venture*

Mr Tony LAU            Partner / Director

**In Attendance for Item 4:**

*EPD*

Ms Clara U                Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North)  
Mr LAM Wai-kit         Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North) 2  
Mr Samuel LUK          Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Water Quality  
Management) 6  
Ms Jolene WONG        Assistant Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North)  
23

*AFCD*

Dr SO Chi-ming         Senior Marine Conservation Officer (Advisory)  
Mr LAM Chun-pong     Marine Conservation Officer (Advisory) 2  
Mr Andrew CHAN       Nature Conservation Officer (Tuen Mun)

Project Proponent Team

*CEDD*

Mr Ricky WONG, JP     Head of Civil Engineering Office  
Mr Henry CHU          Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office (Port & Land)  
Ms Esther YUNG        Chief Engineer / Land Works  
Ms Zoe LO               Senior Engineer / 7

*Development Bureau (DEVB)*

Ms Belinda CHONG Principle Assistant Secretary (Planning & Lands) 7

Mr Kevin LEUNG Assistant Secretary (Planning) 8

*PlanD*

Ms Doris TING Chief Town Planner / Strategic Planning

Project Consultants

*Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited*

Mr Franki CHIU Director (Environmental)

*ERM - Hong Kong Limited*

Dr Jasmine NG Ecologist

\*\*\*\*\*

Action

The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting.

**Item 1 : Confirmation of the draft minutes of the 272<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 11 December 2025 (Closed-door session)**

2. The draft minutes of the last meeting were confirmed without any proposed amendments.

**Item 2 : Matters arising (Closed-door session)**

3. There were no matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting.

**Item 3 : Updates on the Implementation of Environmental Plans (including the Habitat Creation and Management Plan), Environmental Monitoring and Ecological Mitigation / Enhancement Measures of the San Tin Technopole Project (ACE Paper 1/2026)**

4. The Chairman invited Members to refer to *ACE Paper 1/2026* which provided the detailed Habitat Creation and Management Plan and the implementation progress of the Interim Wetland Enhancement Plan, the Implementation Plan for Wetland Enhancement Measures at Mai Po, the Detailed Design Plan for Establishment of Wildlife Corridors, and the environmental monitoring results and effectiveness of ecological mitigation / enhancement measures, as required under Approval Conditions (1) and (6) for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report on San Tin / Lok Ma Chau Development Node.

5. There was no declaration of interest by Members.

*(The presentation team joined the meeting at this juncture.)*

**Presentation cum Question-and-Answer Session (Open session)**

6. Ms Joyce Lau gave an opening remark while Mr Freeman Cheung briefed Members on the latest progress of the San Tin Technopole (STT) project with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

*Wetland Management*

7. In response to a Member's question on the collaboration arrangements including data exchange, experience sharing etc. with the neighbouring wetlands across the border, Ms Joyce Lau explained that CEDD had studied the wetland operations in Shenzhen Futian Mangrove Nature Reserve with a view to drawing on their successful experiences for designing the STT project and operational framework. Mr Simon Chan supplemented that a 2 000-hectare (ha) wetland conservation park would be provided in the Northern Metropolis (NM) development which covered the Sam Po Shue Wetland Conservation Park (SPS WCP), the compensation wetlands in Lok Ma Chau and Mai Po Nature Reserve etc. He said that AFCD would collaborate with the Futian Mangrove Nature Reserve of Shenzhen on the management of the interconnected wetland areas and a Memorandum of Understanding had been signed to facilitate the exchange of ecological data and coordination of management efforts. He said that there were ongoing collaborations with Futian on the removal of invasive species such as *Sonneratia*, the coordinated bird surveys on endangered species such as the Black-faced Spoonbill. As for the Lok Ma Chau mitigation wetland, AFCD would continue to monitor the management practices of the MTR to ensure that they were in alignment with those adopted in SPS WCP. He aspired that the wetlands in NM would continue to be managed in a coordinated manner in the future.

8. A Member suggested that the Government should explore joining Shenzhen's trial projects concerning the removal of *Sonneratia* with a view to resolving the issue for the long-term benefits of the whole region. Mr Simon Chan indicated that AFCD had been working with Futian on the clearance of *Sonneratia* before their seeding season. He explained that for the STT project, they aimed to clear up the mudflats to maintain a habitat for birds whereas the *Sonneratia* located in the deeper mangrove areas would be handled at a later stage.

9. To address a Member's enquiry on the plans to ensure the long-term supply and retainment of water for the planned open space at Mai Po Lung Village (MPLV) Egretty, Ms Joyce Lau shared that while the habitat design at MPLV Egretty was yet to be finalised, CEDD's initial plan was to make use of the low-lying terrain for creating water ponds through accumulation of rainwater. She said that CEDD would continue to work on the design in consultation with the stakeholders concerned including environmental groups and AFCD, and CEDD would keep the ACE informed of the progress.

10. A Member further enquired about the plans on regular desilting works at *gei wai* to enhance water circulation in the ecosystem and the measures to tackle the difficulties in conducting dredging works in Deep Bay. Ms Joyce Lau highlighted that the key challenges were safety and the limited accessibility of the sites which made it difficult to deploy machinery or vessels for desilting works. She shared that a new water channel into Deep Bay would be needed for the disposal of larger quantity of desilted materials. Ms Lau said that CEDD would explore other more cost-effective, time-efficient and environmental-friendly methods in consultation with the contractor, AFCD and green groups. She assured that CEDD would strive to balance environmental protection and safety of workers in the process.

### *AI Applications*

11. A Member opined that AI could provide useful data for the implementation of mitigation measures for habitat preservation and flood management, and such data should be shared with the public and relevant non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Another Member suggested that AI applications such as the AI bird recognition system introduced by EPD could be explored for continuous wildlife monitoring and species identification. In addition, a database could be created to share the conservation outcomes for wider public engagement and to serve as reference for future projects.

12. Ms Joyce Lau said that CEDD had made reference to the AI bird recognition system of EPD in preparing the tender specifications and would explore wider application of AI for environmental protection and monitoring of various species. In response to a Member's enquiry on management of videos and data collected during the monitoring process, Ms Lau said that the data would be managed by the Government while an operator would be engaged for the operation. She assured that the collected data would be shared with the public as far as possible except for sensitive information such as the exact locations of sensitive species.

13. Mr Peter Poon supplemented that intelligent sluice gates would be installed between fish ponds and *gei wai* to control the water level through a comprehensive logistics management system. CEDD aimed to deploy AI in an integrated control centre for overall data collection, visitor management, birds and wildlife monitoring as well as water level control at fish ponds and *gei wai*.

### *Project Management*

14. Having regard to a Member's question on the phasing plan for the SPS WCP, Ms Joyce Lau said that the Government aspired to expedite the development of the SPS WCP with a view to enhancing the ecological capacity in the area to compensate for the loss of wetland habitat arising from the development of the STT. As such, works requiring no land acquisition or Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) applications would be grouped under Phase 1 for completion by 2031 while

areas involving land acquisition would be handled in Phase 2 which was scheduled for completion by 2039.

15. A Member highlighted the importance of integrating sustainability considerations in the construction process and reminded that early financial plans, such as appropriate green finance tools, should be in place to support conservation in the long run after the construction of the SPS WCP. Noting the importance of green finance in development projects, Ms Joyce Lau informed that CEDD had lined up consultation meetings with stakeholders on green finance when the Nature-based Solutions (NbS) Design Guidelines were promulgated in early March. She said that the Government would consider the financial requirements of the SPS WCP and work with the sectors concerned to see how the matter could be taken forward.

16. A Member enquired about the criteria for the selection of partner NGOs and whether the mixed management model would be adopted for the whole SPS WCP area. Mr Simon Chan explained that a mixed model involving different stakeholders would be required for the management of the extensive project areas including different types of wetlands and facilities such as eco-friendly fish ponds, *gei wai* and eco-tourism sites. Similar to the Long Valley Nature Park, Mr Chan indicated that AFCD aimed to partner with appropriate groups for the effective management of different zones in the project, such as fisheries groups for fish ponds and other NGOs for ecological management.

*NbS*

17. In response to a Member's questions on the work to support the implementation of the updated Hong Kong Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP), Ms Joyce Lau shared that CEDD had worked closely with AFCD in the development of the SPS WCP and NbS Design Guidelines. She highlighted that the NbS Design Guidelines could provide a framework to facilitate the integration of natural ecosystems into infrastructure and development projects. She assured that CEDD would optimise the design of the SPS WCP and monitor the implementation continuously. Mr Simon Chan supplemented that the STT project was aligning well with the conservation strategies outlined in the BSAP in various aspects including the adoption of NbS and wildlife-friendly design features, the development of the SPS WCP for ecological restoration etc.

18. A Member suggested the establishment of a set of standardised guidelines for bird-friendly building designs to facilitate their adoption in EIA projects or wider application as a standard in the Greater Bay Area. Ms Joyce Lau confirmed that CEDD had made reference to overseas standards in drawing up the bird-friendly design guidelines for the STT project which had incorporated district-specific characteristics and requirements. If the guidelines were to be applied elsewhere, more detailed considerations would be necessary.

*Public Engagement*

19. On a Member's question concerning plans to mobilise more public participation in the conservation project, Ms Joyce Lau explained that CEDD had done a lot of preparation work including information collection, the establishment of an Environmental Committee (EC), outreach to green groups etc. on putting forward the STT and SPS WCP. Ms Lau furthered that a public consultation exercise would be conducted in March and April to gather views from stakeholders including fisheries organisations, eco-tourism groups, green organisations, academic representatives etc. She said that CEDD would maintain close communication with the groups concerned throughout the development process.

*Conclusion*

20. Members were pleased with CEDD's efforts in preparing the report with due consideration of various issues including comments of the ACE. The Chairman noted the technicalities of the STT project which involved numerous pilot features such as technological elements, innovative development ideas and new management model. He opined that the STT project could provide valuable insights for future updating of the NbS Design Guidelines and demonstrate Hong Kong's commitment to balancing development and ecological conservation. He encouraged CEDD to keep up the good work and provide regular updates to the ACE.

*(The presentation team left the meeting at this juncture.)*

**Internal Discussion Session (Closed-door)**

*Project Timeline*

21. A Member hoped that the STT project could be expedited to meet the development needs of Hong Kong in the context of the national 15<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan. The Member emphasised that the project design should accommodate potential changes arising from climate effects and national strategic developments given the rather long project timeline. Ms Fabia Tam responded that the Government was committed to expediting the development of the NM. Various facilitation measures had been put in place and more would be introduced such as the introduction of a dedicated legislation empowering the government to devise simplified statutory procedures for the development of NM.

22. A Member held the view that the project proponent should provide a full project timeline comprising both stages of the SPS WCP development to facilitate Members' consideration of the ecological impacts between the two stages. To address the Chairman's question on the need of an EIA for Phase 2 of the SPS WCP, Ms Marlene Ho replied that if any recreational development proposed under the Phase 2 of the SPS WCP would be located within Deep Bay Buffer Zone 1 or 2, it

would be classified as a designated project under the EIAO and direct application for Environmental Permit might be an option.

23. The Chairman sought clarifications on whether the three ponds used for fish stocking were part of the SPS WCP or STT project. Dr Samuel Chui indicated that the fish ponds were not within the STT project (i.e. the three existing ponds were located near the Peter Scott Visitor Centre at Mai Po Nature Reserve and they fell within the boundary of the SPS WCP), and the trial arrangement could demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed measures in achieving the targeted ecological enhancement.

*NbS*

24. A Member opined that the STT project provided a good opportunity for Hong Kong to lead and demonstrate the application of nature finance, such as leveraging blue-green bonds to support wetland conservation and biodiversity enhancement projects. With the newly issued NbS Design Guidelines and the monitoring data collected in the project, the Member considered that the STT project could serve as an exemplary model for green finance which was an area of global interest.

25. With reference to the previous design frameworks, a Member suggested that a generic design guideline should be issued for bird-friendly buildings / structures to speed up the preparation of future EIA studies, particularly for the upcoming projects in the NM. Another Member said that the geographical settings might differ across locations, but it was possible to generalise some parameters to facilitate more specific bird-friendly designs. Mr Gary Tam responded that EPD would explore to work out a guideline for the purpose.

*Publicity and Public Education*

26. Dr Samuel Chui complimented CEDD on the STT project, expressing appreciation for CEDD's responsiveness to EPD's suggestion of showing more video records to vividly demonstrate the environmental benefits achieved through the project. Dr Chui stressed that CEDD should make good use of the data to illustrate scientifically the effectiveness of ecological enhancement to validate the effectiveness of the enhancement measures which could be deployed in other upcoming NM projects. In addition, he viewed that more publicity should be made to showcase the accomplishments. A Member agreed that a comparison of the projected and actual outcomes based on specific environmental data / videos should be conducted to further improve the persuasiveness of the environmental benefits.

27. To go an extra mile from balancing development and conservation, Dr Samuel Chui mentioned that EPD would take every development project as an opportunity for environmental enhancement. He viewed that the STT project had served as a good example to showcase the new strategic direction. The Chairman

remarked that CEDD should be encouraged to work towards the goal of achieving net gain in conservation. He said that the ACE could issue a letter to encourage CEDD to keep up the good efforts in the project.

*(Post-meeting notes: The letter was issued to CEDD and circulated to Members on 17 April 2026.)*

28. A Member considered that CEDD should have a clear vision for the STT project since the NM would be the future gateway of Hong Kong. Highlighting that the Chinese Mainland had been pursuing high quality, healthy, green and eco-living in its developments, the Member reminded that the STT project should also reflect Hong Kong's commitment to establishing a sustainable future through green, eco-friendly, and quality living standards.

29. A Member held the view that the outdoor education process could start before the completion of the SPS WCP as the public could also be engaged in the conservation process. Mr Simon Chan pointed out that there would be security concerns in opening up areas which were still under construction. He said that the Government would explore the possibility of public conservation education and eco-tourism having regard to the progress of the SPS WCP. Ms Fabia Tam considered that the Long Valley Nature Park could serve as a useful reference for the development of the SPS WCP and EEB could convey the Member's suggestion to the NM Co-ordination Office to facilitate their public engagement since the early development stage of the project.

30. A Member added that other than physical visits to wetlands, CEDD could also turn video records into short clips or simple educational materials for broader public outreach.

31. As a follow up of the discussion at the current meeting, Mr Gary Tam remarked that CEDD could be requested to submit a reply letter to the ACE's letter and provide responses on the various comments covered by Members' including publicity, enhancement measures, application of AI, implementation timeline and arrangement, etc. so as to foster mutual communication. In view of the technical details involved, the Chairman considered that the letter could be arranged by EPD with the project proponent.

CEDD/  
EPD

*(Post-meeting notes: To facilitate CEDD's preparation of their reply to the ACE, EPD, who serves as a bridge between the ACE and the project proponent, would assist CEDD on the technical details before formal submission.)*

*(Two Members left the meeting after agenda item 3.)*

**Item 4 : Report on the 163<sup>rd</sup> Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee Meeting (ACE Paper 2/2026)**

32. The Chairman invited Members to refer to ACE Paper 2/2026 which reported the recommendations of the EIASC on the EIA report on Reclamation at Lung Kwu Tan (LKT).

33. The ACE Secretariat reported that at the EIASC meeting held on 13 February 2026, a Member declared that he had been working closely with CEDD on researches related to design and implementation of eco-shorelines and had provided free professional advice to CEDD on the subject project. In addition, he was a founder of a start-up company called afterNATURE which had partnered with some contractors to submit tender for the project. Another Member also declared that his company might submit tender for the subject development. To avoid potential conflict of interests, both Members abstained from joining the subsequent discussion of the project at the meeting.

*(Post-meeting notes: The Member formally resigned from afterNATURE on 17 February 2026.)*

*(The presentation team joined the meeting at this juncture.)*

**Presentation cum Question-and-Answer Session (Open session)**

34. Mr Ricky Wong briefed Members on the background of the project while Mr Franki Chiu reported the key EIA findings, mitigation measures, comments from the public and EIASC Members as well as the project proponent's relevant responses with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

*Green Channels*

35. A Member remarked that the public would recognise the Government's efforts in the project when they saw the environment was improved with beautiful recreational spaces created along the green channels. The Member emphasised that the current design of the eastern green channel should not pose constraints to the subsequent topside development.

36. Mr Ricky Wong explained that the Government would conduct relevant studies before the reclamation works with a view to ensuring integrated development of the green channels and the surrounding areas where amenity, pedestrian pathways and green landscape, etc. would be proposed. Moreover, building height of the area would also be of relatively low-rise nature with appropriate setback to minimise the impact on local wildlife, particularly the egret. Mr Wong indicated that the design would integrate natural features to create a harmonious environment near the green channel. Mr Franki Chiu added that the topside development would include a new sewage treatment works and a set of new public sewers to support the overall LKT

development and to prevent direct discharge of sewage into the eastern green channel. Concerning the Chairman's question on the land status of the 34 ha of existing land in the LKT area, Ms Doris Ting responded that roughly half was privately-owned and half was government land, and the existing private land was primarily occupied by brownfield operations.

### *Environmental Impacts*

37. A Member appreciated the proposed improvement measures, including reduced reclamation area, natural shoreline preservation, and building height restrictions. He aspired that the project could enhance the existing environmental conditions while supporting development of industries. In response to the Member's questions on the location for the deployment of artificial reefs, Mr Franki Chiu replied that further studies would be conducted to identify suitable locations, and the potential factors to be considered would include bathymetry, water current, etc. Mr Ricky Wong added that the project proponent would work out the details including the design, size, quantity, scale and placement of the artificial reefs in consultation with AFCD during the detailed design stage, ensuring no disruption to navigation channels while fisheries resources could be enhanced.

38. A Member expressed appreciation in the project proponent's proactive responses to the comments from the EIASC and the related recommendations put forward. With the deployment of AI cameras for monitoring the egret, she remarked that it was not necessary to limit the monitoring period to only the breeding season from February to August as continuous monitoring could provide valuable data for the project. Mr Ricky Wong shared that CEDD had initiated discussions with AFCD and EPD on the deployment of AI cameras for observing egrets' activities and would proceed with the installation of AI cameras in 2026.

39. With reference to a Member's questions about the sea-crossing bridge connecting to the southern side of the LKT reclamation area and its impacts on the local traffic, Mr Ricky Wong said that a separate EIA would be submitted for the sea-crossing bridge and the upgrading of Lung Mun Road tentatively by 2027. He shared that a preliminary traffic impact assessment had been conducted under the Planning and Engineering Study of LKT Reclamation & the Re-Planning of Tuen Mun West Area, confirming the necessity of the proposed sea-crossing bridge to cope with the increased traffic flow arising from the development and to reduce the traffic load along LKT Road, especially near the LKT Village. Mr Wong further explained that junction improvement works along Lung Mun Road would also be undertaken to facilitate the topside development in future.

40. To address the Chairman's enquiry on the timeline, traffic impacts and coordination of the reclamation works and upgrading of Lung Mun Road, Mr Ricky Wong remarked that the reclamation works and the dredging works for the rearrangement of submarine outfall works would be mainly conducted using marine vessels, such as marine dredger and Deep Cement Mixing (DCM) barge. The project

proponent aimed to utilise the marine vessels for transporting fill materials from the nearby Tuen Mun Area 38 fill bank. Mr Wong said that, subject to funding application for the proposed road infrastructure works, the relevant construction works could tentatively commence in 2031.

### *Conclusion*

41. Members were supportive of the project and appreciative of the project proponent's efforts in proactively engaging environmental groups and relevant communities throughout the process. Members also noted that the project proponent had been responsive in adopting comments and addressing views from various parties. The Chairman encouraged the project proponent to keep up the good efforts and continue to implement the project with the joint efforts of all parties.

*(The presentation team left the meeting at this juncture.)*

### **Internal Discussion Session (Closed-door session)**

#### *Monitoring Data*

42. A Member sought clarifications on the monitoring period for egrets as the powerpoint presentation had only included data from February to July 2025 while the monitoring period was from February to August 2025. Mr Simon Chan clarified that the typical breeding season for egrets in Hong Kong was from March to August but the observation period had started from February to cater for possible early breeding activities due to climate fluctuations. Mr Gary Tam said that the pre-construction ecological survey and the monitoring for the Lung Kwu Sheung Tan (LKST) Egretty would cover the period from February to August as recommended in the EIA report.

EPD

43. Mr Gary Tam further remarked that the pre-construction survey was meant to update the ecological condition before the commencement of works, ensuring the project aligned with the latest environmental condition prior to actual construction. The EIA remained thorough.

#### *Draft Conditions*

44. Following the principles agreed at the previous meeting, the ACE would continue to include a brief introduction to provide the background on the proposed conditions to facilitate better understanding of why and how the conditions were set. Based on the recommendations of the EIASC with some textual amendments incorporated, the meeting unanimously agreed to endorse the EIA report with the following four conditions.

(a) **Brief Introduction:**

- (i) According to the baseline survey results for marine mammals and the findings of literature review conducted under this EIA, the waters within and in the vicinity of the Project were unlikely important habitats for Chinese White Dolphin (EIA S.8.3.3.17). Nevertheless, the EIA had recommended marine mammal watching by marine mammal observers with the use of smart initiatives to enhance the marine mammal watching works (EIA S.8.9.7.2 and S.8.11.1.2). More specifically, during marine dredging and DCM works, a marine mammal exclusion zone within a radius of 250 m from the dredger / DCM barge would be implemented. The marine mammal exclusion zone would be scanned for at least 30 minutes prior to the start of these marine works. If marine mammals or other megafauna were observed in the marine mammal exclusion zone, the marine works would be delayed until the marine mammals / megafauna had left the zone. **Condition (1)** was recommended in specifying the details of the smart initiatives to enhance the marine mammal watching works.
- (ii) Eco-shoreline would be provided under this Project, spanning about 2 km. As stated in the EIA report (EIA S.8.9.5.5), key considerations for the design of the eco-shoreline included marine conditions, exposure of wave and storm surge, and maintenance, etc. Therefore, the EIA report had recommended the submission of an Eco-shoreline Study Report (ESR) for approval by the DEP to determine the form (e.g. sloping seawall with precast tidal pools, oyster baskets, and textured panels), the detailed design and the specific location of the eco-shoreline, and the implementation programme (EIA S.8.9.5.7). In fact, prior to the submission of the EIA report, the Project Proponent had conducted a series of public engagement activities to collate comments from different stakeholders and had received support for the adoption of the eco-shoreline (EIA S.2.11.1.1). For continuing the public engagement during the course of eco-shoreline design for the Project, **Condition (2)** was recommended for setting up an EC for the Project, comprising government department, green group and academic, to advise on the preparation of the ESR.
- (iii) The EIA had also recommended consideration of other potential ecological enhancement measures, such as artificial reefs (EIA S.8.9.6.1). **Condition (3)** - Artificial Reef Deployment and Management Plan (ARDMP) was thus recommended for determining the specific details of the artificial reefs.
- (iv) The EIA had recommended pre-construction ecological survey during the egret breeding season (i.e. between February and August) prior to commencement of construction activities within 100 m of the LKST Egretty, which was located outside of the Project Site. The survey methodology would be submitted for agreement (EIA S.8.9.4.2). During construction, ecological monitoring of the LKST Egretty would also be conducted at monthly interval

between February and August (EIA S.8.9.4.3). Detailed monitoring methodology would also be submitted for agreement (EIA S.8.9.4.3). Specific mitigation measures would be adopted during construction if the LKST Egretty was found to be active (EIA S.8.9.4.4). To take forward these recommendations from the EIA report and considering the time difference between when the EIA study was conducted and the commencement of construction, **Condition (4)** was recommended to require the setting up of AI-powered device to enhance the monitoring works recommended by the EIA report for the LKST Egretty covering the pre-construction phase (i.e. between February and August prior to the commencement of construction activities within 100 m of the LKST Egretty) and thereafter the construction phase of the Project.

***(b) Conditions of Endorsement***

The Project Proponent should-

- (i) no later than 3 months before the commencement of construction of the Project, submit the details of the smart initiatives (including Passive Acoustic Monitoring and AI-powered camera) to enhance the marine mammal watching works to the DEP for agreement;
- (ii) set up an EC no later than 3 months before the commencement of construction of the Project. The EC should advise on the preparation of the ESR, and the implementation of the eco-shoreline of the Project according to the EIA report and the ESR. The EC should have a wide representation such as representatives of relevant government department (including AFCD), green group and academic. The list of members and terms of reference of the EC should be submitted to the DEP for approval;
- (iii) no later than 3 months before the commencement of construction of the Project, submit an ARDMP to the DEP for approval. The ARDMP should include the design, dimensions, quantity of artificial reef unit(s), location(s), maintenance and monitoring of the artificial reef; and
- (iv) no later than 3 months before the commencement of the pre-construction ecological survey at the LKST Egretty, set up AI-powered device to enhance the monitoring works as recommended by the EIA report for the LKST Egretty. The installed AI-powered device should be operated to cover the pre-construction phase (i.e. between February and August prior to the commencement of construction activities within 100 m of the LKST Egretty) and thereafter the construction phase of the Project.

*(Post-meeting notes: The ACE's comments on the EIA report were submitted to the DEP on 11 March 2026.)*

**Item 5 : Report on the 38<sup>th</sup> Nature Conservation Subcommittee Meeting (ACE Paper 3/2026)**

45. The Nature Conservation Subcommittee (NCSC) Chairman reported the key discussions at the 39<sup>th</sup> NCSC Meeting involving three agenda items on “Updated BSAP”, “AI Bird Recognition and Smart Tree Survey” and “Suggestion from Dr Bosco Chan of WWF Urging an Update of the Wild Animals Protection Ordinance”. Members’ suggestions and key discussions were summarised in ACE Paper 3/2026.

**Item 6 : Any other business (Closed-door session)**

*EIA Report not selected by EIASC for submission to ACE*

46. The EIASC Deputy Chairman reported that since the last ACE Meeting, the EIASC had received the Executive Summary of the EIA report on “Road P1 (Tai Ho - Sunny Bay Section), Lantau”, which was not selected for discussion. The Executive Summary of the relevant EIA report had been circulated to EIASC Members upon the commencement of the public inspection period, with the relevant hyperlinks copied to non-EIASC Members for information. Members were advised to provide their comments, if any, on the EIA report directly to the DEP within the respective public inspection period. Given that the EIA report had not been selected by EIASC for presentation and discussion, the EIASC Deputy Chairman informed Members that EPD had taken that the ACE had no comments on the EIA report under section 8(3)(b) of the EIAO.

47. There was no other business for discussion at the meeting.

**Item 7 : Date of next meeting (Closed-door session)**

48. Members would be advised on the agenda in due course.

49. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:40 p.m.

**ACE Secretariat  
May 2026**