

DISCOVERY BAY CITY OWNERS' COMMITTEE
Minutes of Meeting No.1 2013-14 held on 11th December 2013
7:30pm at MPH, Discovery Bay Office Centre

Members Present:

Mr. Simon Mawdsley	(SM)	Chairman, COC & Midvale VOC
Ms. Alison Dack	(AD)	Chairlady, Siena One VOC
Ms. Amy Yung	(AY)	Chairlady, Beach VOC
Mrs. Baby Hefti	(BH)	Chairlady, Peninsula VOC
Mr. Colin Boshier	(CB)	Chairman, La Vista VOC
Mr. David Kwok	(DK)	Chairman, Chianti VOC
Mr. Eddy Shen	(ES)	Chairman, Headland VOC
Mr. Francis Chiu	(FC)	Chairman, Siena Two B VOC
Ms. Janet Chan	(JC)	Vice-Chairlady, Bijou Hamlet VOC
Dr. Jennie Lee	(JL)	Chairlady, DB Plaza VOC
Ms. Lee Huen Yee	(LHY)	Chairlady, Parkvale VOC
Ms. Maggie Chan	(MC)	Chairlady, Neo Horizon VOC
Mr. Rene Buts	(RB)	Vice-Chairman, Greenvale VOC
Mr. Sam Cole	(SC)	Chairman, Parkridge VOC
Mr. Leslie Fung	(LF)	Representative, Registered Owner
Mr. Tony Cheng	(TC)	Representative, Registered Owner
Mr. Edwin Lu	(EL)	Representative, Clubs
Ms. Anne Busfield	(AB)	Representative, Hotel
Mr. Vincent Chua	(CKC)	Director, DBSML
Mr. F.K. Wong	(FKW)	Chief Manager, Estate, DBSML

Apologies:

Mr. Grant Ramsay	(GR)	Representative, School
Mrs. Judy Mathews	(JM)	Chairlady, Greenvale VOC

Secretary:

Mr. Kenneth Chan	(CYY)	Senior Manager, Estate, DBSML
------------------	-------	-------------------------------

Assistant to Secretary:

Ms. Key Lam	(KL)	Assistant Manager, Community Relations & Admin, DBSML
-------------	------	---

By Invitation:

Mr. W.S. Yau	(WSY)	Senior Manager, Contract Management and Works, DBSML
Mr. Raymond Choi	(RC)	Territory Manager, LPG ExxonMobil Hong Kong Limited

Staff of City Management:

Mr. Wilson Chan	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Ms. Wendy Li	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Alan Mak	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Daniel Ma	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Steve Kwok	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Kenneth Kan	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. G. H. Koo	Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Samuel Ip	Assistant Manager, Estate, DBSML
Mr. Frankie Tsang	Assistant Manager, Security, DBSML

Observers:

Mr. Edward Fan	Owner, Parkvale Village
Mr. Al Dack	Owner, Siena One
Mr. Mario Liu	Owner, Peninsula Village
Mr. Robin Yang	Owner, Peninsula Village
Mr. Ed Rainbow	Owner, Peninsula Village
Mr. Mattras	Owner, Peninsula Village
Mr. Vic Riley	Owner, Midvale Village
Mr. Andrew Burns	Owner, Headland Village
Mr. David Ball	Owner, Headland Village

The Meeting was declared duly convened with the necessary quorum of Members present.

		<u>Action</u>
1.	APOLOGIES	7:33pm
	<p>CYY announced that apologies were received from GR of School, JM of Greenvale but RB would be representing on her behalf. He also welcomed JC, the Vice-chairlady of Bijou Hamlet.</p>	
	<p>1.1 Before discussion, RB questioned the validity of the COC meeting and AY distributed copies of her statement to members and read out at the meeting:</p> <p><i>According to Section VII, Clause 2 (page 40) of the Principal Deed of Mutual Covenant, concerning the composition of the CITY OWNERS' COMMITTEE:</i></p> <p><i>"2. The Members of the Committee shall consist of</i> <i>(a) The Chairman or in his absence the Vice-Chairman of each Village Owners' Committee"...(emphasis added)</i></p> <p><i>The plain language of the DMC requires that all villages be invited to send a representative to the COC.</i></p> <p><i>The notice attached to the agenda issued by Ms. Emily Yuen of City Management on 4th December 2013, failed to invite representatives from La Costa and Hillgrove villages to the so-called "COC Meeting" this evening.</i></p> <p><i>City Management's action has deprived these two villages of their right to take part in this so-called "COC Meeting". As a result, this "COC Meeting" is not properly constituted.</i></p> <p><i>Contrary to City Management's propaganda, the COC is not merely a consultative body. Resolutions passed by the COC are binding on all Owners. This is an extraordinary power, and must be used carefully and lawfully.</i></p> <p><i>As the present meeting is not properly constituted, resolutions presented and passed, if any, cannot have a binding effect.</i></p> <p><i>I now request that all COC members take note of the above statement and of their potential liability for wilful negligence. I also request that my statement be recorded in any minutes or meeting notes of this so-called "COC Meeting".</i></p>	<p>7:35pm</p> <p>NOTED</p>

<p>5.4 RB questioned the validity of the resolution by referring to Clause 2, Section 34D of the BMO, “a reference to a resolution of the owners’ committee is a reference to a resolution passed by a majority of the votes of the members of the owners’ committee present at a meeting convened and conducted in accordance with the deed of mutual covenant.” He also reminded members that the judgement of Headland did not apply to other villages and the COC. Members would be liable to their decision if the resolutions were endorsed.</p> <p>5.5 To compromise, CB suggested adopting the resolutions of the last 12 months instead of from the date of the formation of the COC, and to defer the matter on all other resolutions prior to the last 12 months.</p> <p>5.6 SC asked if his motion could be voted on. SM explained that only amendments to the motion could be allowed and suggested that he could vote against FKW’s motion to express his objection.</p> <p>5.7 CB then put forward his amended motion, with the support of SC and agreement from SM, as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>To endorse the resolutions made by the COC during the last COC term. The matter of older resolutions is to be dealt with later.</i></p> <p>5.8 LHY seconded CB’s amended motion.</p> <p>5.9 AY commented that according to the legal advice, approving the previous resolutions would be ultra vires, as the nine village representatives were not properly appointed.</p> <p>5.10 SC pointed out that approving the past resolutions without verifying them with the BMO and DMC might cause wilful negligence.</p> <p>5.11 By a show of hands, seven members voted in favour (RB, AY, SC, AD, CB, BH and LHY), twelve members voted against (LF, TC, EL, AB, CKC, FKW, JL, JC, ES, DK, MC and FC) and SM abstained. CB’s amendment to FKW’s motion was defeated.</p> <p>5.12 BH was concerned if she and her VOC could be legally liable for adopting the past resolutions. FKW replied that wilful negligence was a deliberate use of wrongful action amounting to the breach of a duty and they would not.</p> <p>5.13 LHY further sought assurance from CM on the matter. FKW pointed out that according to the Principal Deed, the COC was a consultative body and CM was the ultimate party responsible for the management of the City. He reiterated that according to the legal advice regarding the liability of the VOC in making resolutions, as long as the decision of the COC/ VOC was within the ambit of the DMC/Sub-DMC, the COC/ VOC would be protected. Thus, members were not liable to their decisions made. Moreover, for example City reserve fund had been spent for the approved resolutions in the past, his motion served merely as a precaution to avoid possible challenges from the owners. LHY saw the rationale of the resolution but was not sure whether she would be liable of endorsing the resolution.</p>	<p>NOTED</p>
--	--------------

	<p>7.1.4 RB enquired as to why the set up cost applied to transportation only. CKC replied that it was because most COC members were not keen on using the Octopus card for access control.</p> <p>7.1.5 ES supported differentiating DB residents from non DB-residents with the Resident's Card on transportation, so that different fares can be adopted for DB/non-DB residents.</p>	
7.2	<p>Rules of Order of COC Meeting and Renovation Control</p> <p>SM would discuss with SC and LHY before the next COC meeting. SC requested that a representative of Registered Owner and City Management should be present to discuss the rules of order. SM would compile a list.</p>	<p>8:43pm</p> <p>SM/SC/LHY</p>
8.1	<p>COC SUB-COMMITTEE/WORKING GROUP UPDATE</p> <p>Before appointment of the sub-committees, SM invited the conveners of the last term to give a brief report.</p> <p>8.1.1 Environmental Protection Sub-Committee</p> <p>8.1.1.1 COC Paper 424/13 had been issued to members before the meeting.</p> <p>8.1.1.2 In response to FC's mentioning on the Shek Ku Chau Incinerator, AY advised FC not to confuse the Incinerator with the development of the Integrated Waste Management Facilities near Shek Ku Chau.</p> <p>8.1.1.3 RB suggested SM should write a letter on behalf of the COC to the Government to raise objection to the Super Incinerator. SM agreed and asked FC and AY to draft the letter.</p> <p>8.1.2 Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee</p> <p>8.1.2.1 SM would continue to discuss the opportunities of more sports facilities and a better environment and bring back the suggestions to the COC.</p> <p>(JC was excused at 9pm.)</p> <p>8.1.3 Rehabus Working Group</p> <p>8.1.3.1 COC Paper 423/13 had been issued to members before the meeting.</p> <p>8.1.3.2 CB reported that despite various weekend trips that had been organised, there were still some time slots yet to be occupied, therefore the villages could still organize outings.</p> <p>8.1.3.3 He also proposed writing a letter to TD to allow additional qualified organisations to charter the Rehabus. Simon</p>	<p>8:45pm</p> <p>SM/FC/AY</p>

	<p>recapped the following motion</p> <p><i>“To seek COC’s agreement to apply to the Transport Department to seek to amend the ACEESSDB Rehabus licence further in order to allow additional qualified organisations to charter the bus.”</i></p> <p>8.1.3.4 Being seconded by RB, 17 members voted in favour and two abstained, the motion was passed. CYY to help drafting the letter.</p> <p>8.1.3.5 In response to ES’s suggestion for the COC to subsidize the bus with the Owners’ Fund, FKW responded that according to the DMC, the Owners’ Fund could only be used for common facilities but not for donation.</p> <p>8.1.4 BMS Tender Working Group</p> <p>8.1.4.1 Discussion was deferred to Item 9 below.</p> <p>8.1.5 Seniors Community Group</p> <p>8.1.5.1 ES advised that the 1st task would be finding out the number of senior residents in the community before planning any projects. Other suggestions identified including liaising with HKR for suitable premises to form a “Senior Citizens Club”, a discussion with CM for installing a Safety Alarm for the elderly, and improving transportation for the senior residents. RB advised that there was a scheme under Social Welfare Department for the installation of a safety alarm for elderly.</p> <p>8.1.6 Security Liaison Group</p> <p>8.1.6.1 COC Paper 425/13 had been issued to members before the meeting.</p> <p>8.1.6.2 FC reported back on the discussions that had taken place at the last SLG meeting, mainly on burglary, theft and traffic issues. He then sought members’ views on subsidizing the police on the tunnel fees charged while coming to DB for traffic operations.</p> <p>8.1.6.3 In response to CB’s enquiry in the case of emergency, TC explained that government vehicles coming in for emergency purposes could pass through the tunnel immediately without paying the toll on the spot. The tunnel company would send a monthly invoice to various government departments. He further advised that it was the government who had determined the toll charge and the government also shared a percentage of the toll income. Therefore, it would be up to the government to decide whether the toll for government vehicles could be waived. Nevertheless, TC worried that the exemption would set a precedent to other vehicles like</p>	<p>CYY</p>
--	--	------------

	<p>non-government ambulances. SC asked if the tunnel company would support waiving the toll for police cars. TC replied that they would consider it. With the assistance of SM, FC would approach the Transport Commissioner.</p> <p>8.1.6.4 BH also raised her concerns on the increasing burglary cases in Crestmont Villa of Peninsula Village. AD was worried about the speeding vehicles and overtaking buses on Discovery Bay roads.</p> <p>8.1.6.5 FC relayed the reply from the police that they could come to DB more regularly for speed checks and patrols but the cost of operations could not be neglected. He urged other villages to install more CCTV in the long term.</p> <p>8.1.7 Unresolved Issues Working Group</p> <p>8.1.7.1 A meeting was held after the last COC Meeting. The discussion summary had incorporated the comments made by two members and had also been circulated to members, though it had not been passed to HKR yet as the Working Group had not discussed it.</p> <p>8.1.7.2 AY circulated to members the comments and the email correspondences but the secretary had not tabled them as requested by her. She then expressed her dissatisfaction towards the secretary.</p> <p>8.1.7.3 CYY clarified that firstly, the email sent out by AY was received in the late afternoon before the meeting so he did not have enough time to go through it. Secondly, AY's proposed amendments were not the discussion in the Working Group meeting. He reiterated that the discussion summary had already included comments made by the working group members. Besides, circulating the email exchanges between members after the meeting was not standard practice.</p> <p>8.1.7.4 AY responded that CYY had only sent out the report late on the day before the meeting and she had tried her best to retrieve the old information. She would have printed all the comments and email exchanges if she knew they were not being prepared. AY then requested a higher transparency.</p> <p>8.1.7.5 FC enquired as to which part of the minutes were not factual as claimed by AY. She pointed out that the COC had never approved the maintenance of the footpath, which was contrary to the email. CYY responded that he had never mentioned in the email that the Unresolved Issues Working Group had approved it.</p>	FC
--	--	----

	<p>8.1.7.6 SM confirmed that the comments from two members had been included in the discussion summary. He further stressed that no post-meeting discussion should be added in the summary.</p> <p>8.1.7.7 With regard to the accuracy of the discussion summary, AY wondered why some remarks had not been removed as requested by a working group member. CYY replied that the discussion summary had not been confirmed by the Working Group yet and hence they had not been sent to HKR yet as requested by members.</p> <p>8.1.7.8 To conclude, CKC suggested further discussion of the issues in the working group meeting.</p>	
<p>8.2</p>	<p>Appointment of Sub-Committees and Working Groups</p> <p>8.2.1 Finance Sub-Committee</p> <p>8.2.1.1 CB proposed AY and AY accepted the nomination. RB seconded it. FC nominated MC. MC accepted the nomination and DK seconded it. AY requested and RB supported the voting be conducted by poll. Before voting, the two candidates made a self-introduction.</p> <p>8.2.1.2 AY introduced to members that she is a certified public accountant holding a practice certificate in Hong Kong and CPA in the UK. She has practiced accounting for many years and has her own practice. She has been the FSC convener since it was formed and knows the deeds of the DMC, BMO relating to all the finance requirements from the building manager. In the last 10 years, AY said that she had managed to chase millions of dollars on behalf of the owners with regards to management fees and insurance claims. She felt that someone with an accounting background should be the convener.</p> <p>8.2.1.3 MC said she has retired now but used to run her own business. Although accounting was not her expertise, her 20 years of involvement in the business industry had trained her alertness towards figures, particularly on income and expenditure. Therefore she believed that she is capable and suitable to manage the CM accounts. Being the FSC convener for the last term, MC said she had successfully reduced the City expenses in the past 6 months, reducing the cost of cleaning the pier from \$300,000 to \$150,000 and the Halloween decoration cost from \$80,000 to \$60,000. If she were to be re-elected, she would continue to fulfil the responsibilities of being the convener of the FSC.</p> <p>8.2.1.4 Seven members voted in favour of AY (RB, AY, SC, AD, CB, BH and LHY). Eight members voted in favour of MC</p>	<p>9:39pm</p>

	<p>(FC, MC, DK, ES, JL, TC, LF and EL) and three members abstained (SM, CKC and FKW).</p> <p>8.2.1.5 After the calculation of shares represented by each member, CYY announced the result for the post of FSC convener. The shares in favour of AY were 83,706, the shares in favour of MC were 120,770 and 30,170 abstained. CYY announced that MC was elected the convener of the FSC.</p> <p>8.2.2 Environmental Protection Sub-Committee</p> <p>8.2.2.1 LHY proposed FC and FC accepted the nomination. MC seconded it. RB nominated BH but BH declined.</p> <p>8.2.2.2 There were no other nominations. CYY declared FC to be the convener.</p> <p>8.2.3 Sports and Leisure Sub-Committee</p> <p>8.2.3.1 CB proposed RB and RB accepted the nomination. AY seconded it. ES nominated SM. SM accepted it and JL seconded it. Before voting, the two candidates made a self-introduction.</p> <p>8.2.3.2 RB only said that the COC Chairperson should not chair any other Sub-Committee</p> <p>8.2.3.3 SM informed members that over the past 2 years, he had enjoyed interacting with the people around DB, and learnt a lot about what people actually want to and didn't want to do. He discovered that a large number of people regularly come to DB as part of their sporting activities. Many sports teams came in after the opening of the DBN Sports Pitch and he has even heard talk of holding tournaments in DB. SM said he had a passion to help people in DB and to understand what they want to do in their leisure time.</p> <p>8.2.3.4 AY requested and supported by RB the voting to be conducted by poll.</p> <p>8.2.3.5 Five members voted in favour of RB (RB, AY, SC, AD and CB). Twelve members voted in favour of SM (LHY, FC, MC, DK, SM, CKC, FKW, TC, LF, ES, JL and EL) and BH abstained.</p> <p>8.2.3.6 After calculation of shares represented by each member, CYY announced the result for post of SLSC convener. The shares in favour of RB were 47,319, the shares in favour of SM were 160,222 and 26,120 abstained. CYY announced that SM was elected the convener of the SLSC.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>8.2.4 Rehab Bus Working Group</p> <p>8.2.4.1 RB nominated CB. CB accepted the nomination, which was seconded by three members including AY, RB and LHY.</p> <p>8.2.4.2 There were no other nominations. CYY declared CB to be the convener.</p> <p>8.2.5 BMS Tender Working Group</p> <p>8.2.5.1 WSY advised members that tenders had been received which were being analysed by the consultant. Before presenting the tender analysis and recommendation to the COC, there was no task for the working group.</p> <p>8.2.5.2 RB opined that the working group should conduct the tender analysis. WSY clarified that the consultant was the professional party and was to conduct the analysis. RB further queried whether the tender document had incorporated all comments made by the working group. FKW confirmed that all members' comments were already included.</p> <p>8.2.5.3 FKW was of the view that RB was not in a position to be involved as his village selected to opt out of the tender. He further advised that the working group could be suspended as the working group had finished its duty to comment on the tender document. The next step was for the COC and VOCs to discuss and confirm the recommendation.</p> <p>8.2.6 Seniors Community Group</p> <p>8.2.6.1 RB proposed ES and ES accepted the nomination. MC seconded it.</p> <p>8.2.6.2 There were no other nominations. CYY declared ES to be the convener.</p> <p>8.2.7 Security Liaison Group</p> <p>8.2.7.1 DK proposed FC and FC accepted the nomination. MC seconded it.</p> <p>8.2.7.2 There were no other nominations. CYY declared FC to be the convener.</p> <p>8.2.8 Unresolved Issues Working Group</p> <p>8.2.8.1 MC proposed SM and SM accepted the nomination. DK seconded it.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>8.2.8.2 There were no other nominations. CYY declared SM to be the convener.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>CM REPORT</p> <p>9.1 CYY and WSY presented the CM Report with the following items: Upcoming tenders, COC papers endorsed, fall arrest system at slopes, HD CCTV system along Discovery Bay Road and community events.</p> <p>(JL and AB were excused at 10:05pm.)</p> <p>9.2 Regarding the tender for insurance 2013-14, replacement of defective road lighting poles in DB, tender for corrective maintenance work on ELV system, comprehensive maintenance of SMATV system, tender for audit service 2013-15, replacement of activated carbon media, filters and associated works for deodorizer units in pumping stations and supply and installation of wireless HD CCTV at City area, CYY reported that as there had been no objections and had majority support from members, and that the contracts had been signed.</p> <p>(FC was excused at 10:20pm.)</p> <p>9.3 AY had two comments on the report. Firstly, she could not endorse the papers since she had not been properly elected in the previous election. Secondly, she wondered why CM had rejected the Islands District Council funding for Chinese New Year Decorations as some funding had been allocated to DB.</p> <p>9.4 In response to the second comment, CYY explained that CM had not applied for the funding since the Piazza decorations had already been undertaken by HKR and no other venue was considered appropriate for the decorations. He took AY's suggestion that the bus stops could be decorated next year but he reminded members that a budget had to be provided, as the funding could not cover all the expenses.</p> <p>(MC was excused at 10:25pm.)</p> <p>9.5 Regarding the fall arrest system at slopes, AD observed that the anchor plinths were larger than those shown before the trial. WSY agreed that they had been made larger after a detailed design by the contractor. This was done to eliminate kicking and falling down because bigger plinths could catch workers more easily. As for the eyesore, when the grass grew longer, it would cover the plinths.</p> <p>9.6 FKW supplemented that CM was carrying out a pull out test with smaller plinths. When an optimum plinth size was identified, it would be installed in other villages.</p> <p>9.7 While showing two videos using the system, FKW advised members that the efficiency of grass cutting would be reduced after the fall arrest system was installed. After evaluating the impact CM would report to the COC.</p> <p>9.8 SM enquired about the way forward. FKW replied that CM would complete the installation at the dam and invite outside contractors to use it before</p>	<p>10:02pm</p>

	<p>10.1.2 Members agreed that the booking rates would remain the same in 2014. There were no objections from members regarding the charging rate for the hiring of storage areas</p> <p>(DK was excused at 10:32pm.)</p>	NOTED
10.2	<p>Right of Way – Pedestrians, Cyclists and Vehicles and Proposed Amendment / Addition to the City Rules</p> <p>(SC was excused at 10:45pm.)</p> <p>10.2.1 COC Paper 416/13 had been issued to members before the meeting.</p> <p>10.2.2 Apart from the two recommendations as stated on her paper, AY highlighted four additional recommendations which included setting more pedestrian crossings near the schools and the bus terminal, erecting speed limit signs at the exit of the DB Tunnel to alert incoming drivers of the speed limit in DB, painting double white lines all along DB Road to stop overtaking, and requesting the Police to conduct more speed tests. Instead of amending the City Rules, she viewed that the above measures should be taken.</p> <p>10.2.3 SM introduced a device that could tell the travelling speed of a vehicle and had a camera attached to take photos. If a vehicle broke the speed limit, a photo would automatically be taken and sent to CM.</p> <p>10.2.4 With respect to AY's paper, FKW clarified that Clause 1A Section VI of the City Rules was only applicable to external vehicles. Therefore, it was not applicable to AY's recommendation of issuing HKR/DBR number plates, as they were licensed vehicles. Instead, there was another provision in the City Rules, governing the speeding of licensed vehicles, which was a more stringent penalty system.</p> <p>10.2.5 Regarding the additional recommendations, FKW explained that if the signs and road markings were not included in the Code of Practice, they would be required to be approved by TD and, to do so, a consultant was required to be appointed for application.</p> <p>10.2.6 In response to BH's enquiry of the installation of road humps in villages, FKW indicated that CM was open to the idea and it was up to the decision made between the individual VOC's.</p> <p>10.2.7 AY would conduct further research to address the concern on road safety and would provide an update at the next COC meeting.</p>	<p>10:45pm</p> <p>AY</p>
10.3	<p>Letter to Transport Department regarding a Two Dollar Bus Fare Petition from DB Seniors</p> <p>SM received a petition from a group of seniors urging TD to explore the possibility of introducing a \$2 bus fare to the two licensed external routes. Although it was not possible, HKR had offered concession fares to seniors for the Sunny Bay and Tung Chung routes. SM would pass it on to ES to pursue other options as part of the Seniors Community Working Group.</p>	<p>10:56pm</p> <p>ES</p>

	<p>resolutions en bloc because the terms and details of the financial implications were never disclosed to the COC when HKR negotiated with the Government. All the agreements were signed by HKR and the Lands Department. When she was the FSC convener at the time, she discovered that it was CM who paid the bill that was sent to HKR. She viewed that it was inappropriate according to the accounting principle. Therefore, she suggested not discussing it because she disagreed with the bill being borne by the small owners. She also said that members who approved those resolutions would bear the consequences if the owners took legal action against CM for paying the bills and putting financial responsibility on the owners in the past.</p> <p>11.3.3 LHY enquired as to the amount of the rent. FKW replied that the rent for the drainage pipe had increased from \$467,000 to \$622,000, and the potable water pipe had increased from \$486,000 to \$648,000.</p> <p>11.3.4 In response to CB's enquiry of the rent for the pumping station, FKW said that it was under STT No. CX 1333. CB agreed with AY that the rent should be paid by HKR.</p>	NOTED
11.4	<p>Hong Kong International Airport visit</p> <p>CYY informed that the Hong Kong International Airport would like to invite members to attend the site visit, regarding the proposed third runway. When the date was confirmed CYY would notify all members.</p>	<p>11:10pm</p> <p>CYY</p>
12	<p>Items for Discussion at the Next Meeting</p> <p>ES proposed an item for discussion for the next meeting with regards to the underground water pipe replacements throughout DB. He suggested that a working group should be assembled along with appointing a consultant to discuss the matter. He also asked WSY to find the previous consultant report for reference. RB commented that the commencement of the work should start in Year 2015 as agreed by the COC previously.</p>	11:15pm

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15pm.

Chairman