

(Translation)

Minutes of Meeting of Traffic and Transport Committee

Date : 21 January 2019 (Monday)

Time : 2:00 p.m.

Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong.

Present

Chairman

Mr WONG Man-hon

Members

Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS

Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, JP

Mr CHAN Lin-wai

Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken

Mr FAN Chi-ping

Mr LOU Cheuk-wing

Ms YU Lai-fan

Ms LEE Kwai-chun

Ms YUNG Wing-sheung, Amy

Mr CHOW Ho-ding, Holden

Ms TSANG Sau-ho, Josephine

Mr KWOK Ping, Eric

Ms FU Hiu-lam, Sammi

Mr WONG Ma-tim

Mr YIP Pui-kei

Mr YUEN King-hang

Mr LAU Chin-pang

Mr LEE Ka-ho

Attendance by Invitation

Mr YIU Chiu-chung

Mr LEUNG Ho-kwun

Mr LI Wai-fan, Edmond

Mr Kevin LI

Mr Carson FUNG

Mr YIP Ho-yeung

Senior Engineer 2/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department

Engineer 2/Universal Accessibility, Highways Department

Senior Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry 1, Transport Department

Public Affairs Manager, Citybus Limited

Senior Operations Officer, Citybus Limited

Administration Manager, Coronet Ray Development Limited

Mr Rayson LAW	Planning and Support Officer I, Long Win Bus Company Limited
Ms Annie LAM	Public Relations Manager - External Affairs, MTR Corporation Limited
Ms Jessica LEUNG	Senior Public Relations Executive - External Affairs, MTR Corporation Limited
Mr Martin CHEUNG	Deputy Managing Director, Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited
Mr Patrick CHONG	Project Engineer, Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited
Ms Betsy LEUNG	Assistant Manager, Public Affairs, The Kowloon Motor Bus Co.(1933) Limited

In Attendance

Mr AU Sheung-man, Benjamin	Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
Miss CHOI Siu-man, Sherman	Senior Transport Officer/Islands1, Transport Department
Miss SIN Kai-wai Marie	Senior Transport Officer/Islands2, Transport Department
Ms YUEN Kit-fung	Engineer/Islands 2, Transport Department
Ms POON Nga-man, Amy	District Engineer/General (2)A, Highways Department
Mr AU Hok-lang	Engineer/22 (Lantau), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr YU Siu-bun	Assistant District Operations Officer (Lantau), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr LAM Yiu-tong	OC Operations Sub-Unit (Cheung Chau Division), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr WONG Wah	Administrative Consultant, New Lantau Bus Co.(1973) Limited
Mr CHAN Tin-lung	Deputy General Manager, New Lantau Bus Co.(1973) Limited
Mr Peter TSANG	Senior Manager-Transportation, Discovery Bay Transit Services Limited
Mr CHAN Kam-hung	Chairman, Lantau Taxi Association
Ms CHAU Shuk-man, Anthea	Corporate Communications Manager, New World First Ferry Services Limited
Ms LAM Wai-ling, April	General Manager, Hong Kong & Kowloon Ferry Holdings Limited

Secretary

Ms CHAN Ka-ying, Florence	Executive Officer I (District Council), Islands District Office
---------------------------	---

Absent with Apology

Mr CHEUNG Fu
Mr KWONG Koon-wan
Mr TANG Ka-piu, Bill, JP
Mr HO Siu-kei
Mr WONG Fuk-kan
Mr WAN Tung-yat

Welcoming Remarks

The Chairman welcomed Members, representatives of the government departments and organisations to the meeting and introduced the following representatives who attended the meeting:

- (a) Mr YU Siu-bun, Assistant District Operations Officer (Lantau) of the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) who attended the meeting in place of Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung;
- (b) Mr LAM Yiu-tong, OC Operations Sub-Unit (Cheung Chau Division) of HKPF who attended the meeting in place of Mr TAI Cheuk-yin; and
- (c) Mr Peter TSANG, Senior Manager-Transportation of Discovery Bay Transit Services Limited (DBTSL) who attended the meeting in place of Mr Vincent CHUA of HKR International Limited.

2. Members noted that the Vice-Chairman Mr CHEUNG Fu, Mr Bill TANG, Mr KWONG Koon-wan, Mr WONG Fuk-kan, Mr HO Siu-kei and Mr WAN Tung-yat were unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments.

I. Confirmation of the Minutes of Meeting held on 19 November 2018

3. The Chairman said that the captioned draft minutes had incorporated the amendments proposed by the government departments, guests and Members, and had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

4. Mr Holden CHOW expressed his views as follows:

- (a) At the previous meeting, Members conducted an in-depth discussion on the crowdedness in Tung Chung after the commissioning of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) Hong Kong Port. He enquired about the latest relocation arrangement for the bus stop of New Lantau Bus (NLB) route no. B6. To his understanding, the departments concerned had consulted Members in respect of the new relocation arrangement for the bus stop of route no. B6. He and some Members proposed that the bus stop be relocated to the side of Tat Tung Road Public Toilet. As the Lunar New Year (LNY) was approaching, he hoped that the Transport Department (TD) would implement the relocation arrangement as soon as possible. He said that there were merits and demerits for various options and locations that none of them was perfect. The way forward was to minimise the impact through assessment and select the simplest option.
- (b) He had conducted on-site inspections at the above location and opined that there were many problems with the ancillary facilities. There were

1 or 2 trees at the location with a tall trunk and long branches which might hinder buses of route no. B6 from pulling in at the bus stop. He had requested the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to conduct suitable pruning and the arrangement was being considered. He hoped that pruning could be completed before relocation of the bus stop.

- (c) He enquired when the bus stop was relocated to the spot, whether the TD could set up clear signs in the vicinity to direct passengers to Tat Tung Road Garden where they could assemble. He enquired whether TD had anything to supplement.

5. Mr WONG Wah expressed his views as follows:

- (a) With regard to bus stop relocation of NLB route no. B6, he said that the patronage of route no. B6 had decreased by half. He queried whether there was such a need to relocate the bus stop but stated that the bus company would coordinate with the relocation exercise.
- (b) He inspected the trees mentioned by Mr Holden CHOW on site and found that pruning had been completed. However, only smaller branches, but not the large trunks which could damage buses passing by, were pruned. He proposed that traffic cones be placed to remind drivers to avoid the trunks. In that case, however, buses passing the location would cross into the adjacent lane and take up one-fourth of the space.
- (c) He enquired whether the relocation of route no. B6 bus stop was temporary, and why not relocating the bus stop to the new bus terminus at Citygate which would be completed soon.

6. Miss Sherman CHOI made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The temporary relocation arrangement for route no. B6 bus stop was discussed at the previous meeting. Members proposed 3 sites, including the coach parking space opposite Citygate (South) Carpark, the lay-by on Tat Tung Road outside Tat Tung Road public toilet and Tung Chung Temporary Bus Terminus for TD's consideration to cope with the demand of tourists better, particularly during the possible peak season in LNY. TD would like to report at the meeting the progress of the proposals raised in the previous meeting. It would also respond to the concerns of Mr Holden CHOW and the bus company in due course.
- (b) After completion of the study and assessment in December, TD consulted the Committee in respect of the results of assessment and the consultation was completed in mid-January. The majority of Members proposed relocating on a trial basis the bus stop of route no. B6 to the lay-by on Tat Tung Road outside Tat Tung Road public toilet. On 14 January of this year, the representatives of TD, Islands District Office (IsDO), the Police

and the bus company met to discuss the feasibility of implementing the options and related detailed arrangements, and conducted a site inspection around Tat Tung Road public toilet on 16 January 2019. All departments concerned and the bus company agreed to implement the temporary relocation arrangement from 28 January to 10 February 2019, so as to minimise the impact of tourist activities on Tung Chung residents during LNY.

- (c) During relocation, the 2 pick-up and drop-off points of coaches near Tat Tung Road Public Toilet would be designated as the stop of NLB route no. B6, whereas the coach parking space in front would be used for boarding and alighting activities of coaches, which had to be parked somewhere else.
- (d) As for routeing, route no. B6 would inevitably travel through the entire Tat Tung Road, thus increasing the traffic pressure thereat.
- (e) According to past experience, there would be longer queues for the South Lantau routes at the temporary bus stop during LNY. The queue for NLB route no. 23 might extend to the section of Tat Tung Road outside the public toilet and meet the queue for route no. B6 after bus stop relocation, thus causing chaos. After the site inspection, the bus company agreed to relocate the queueing area for NLB route no. 23 to the cycle track outside Tat Tung Road public toilet during peak hours, so that the queue would extend to the pavement by the side of the cycle track, while the queue for NLB route no. B6 would extend westward in the direction of the bus stop under the bridge to avoid chaos caused by the meeting of the 2 queues. For other period of time, passengers of NLB route no. B6 would queue in the direction of the cycle track as originally planned.
- (f) The bus company agreed to deploy staff at the bus stop of route no. B6 to maintain passenger queue order and place signage to direct passengers to the new bus stop. The Police would also deploy staff to maintain order and ensure pedestrian safety at the site and implement appropriate traffic arrangement according to the situation.
- (g) With regard to the arrangement for tree trunk pruning, TD had earlier informed LCSD for follow-up. However, the representative of the bus company found that the trunks still affected bus operation during site inspection. The department would inform LCSD for further follow-up after the meeting.
- (h) With regard to the proposal of directing tourists to Tat Tung Road Garden where they could assemble raised by Mr Holden CHOW, TD would inform relevant departments for follow-up.

7. Mr Holden CHOW expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He appreciated the detailed reply by the representative of TD. He had further proposals after learning the department's arrangements.
- (b) During the peak season from 28 January to 10 February when the relocation arrangement was effective, he hoped that the Police could deploy more staff to the location to manage the pedestrian flow, guide passengers to queue up, direct traffic or help maintaining order.
- (c) Regarding queueing arrangement, mills barriers had been placed at the bus stop of route no. B6 to cope with the long queue and the order was significantly improved. As such, he hoped that when the bus stop was relocated to the side of Tat Tung Road Public Toilet, TD would place metal railings and mills barriers thereat to maintain order.
- (d) He believed that the departments concerned would closely monitor the situation of bus stop relocation and relevant measures during the LNY peak season. If necessary, the stop could still be used after LNY. In addition, Members had enquired many times the date of commissioning of the new bus terminus at Citygate Phase II but no concrete reply had been given. He opined that an assessment of the suitability of relocating the bus stop of NLB route no. B6 to the new bus terminus at Citygate Phase II should be conducted after its commissioning. However, it was inadvisable to cancel the temporary relocation arrangement for the bus stop of NLB route no. B6 when the commissioning date of the new bus terminus was unclear. He reiterated that LNY was a peak season and proper arrangements and preparations should be made in advance to avoid causing inconvenience to the public.

8. Mr Eric KWOK thanked TD for offering a temporary short-term solution. Agenda item 11 was a question about mitigating the congestion at Tat Tung Road, Tung Chung. He hoped that during the discussion, optimal use of the large area of bicycle parking spaces outside Tat Tung Road Public Toilet and provision of traffic facilities for tourist coaches, route no. B6 and other buses could be studied. Even if the bus stop of route no. B6 would be relocated to the new terminus at Citygate Phase II in the future, the area might still be affected. As such, he opined that in long-term planning, the space beside Tat Tung Road should be effectively used.

9. Mr LEE Ka-ho expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The temporary relocation plan of the bus stop of route no. B6 mentioned by TD would create 2 problems. One was about queueing and the other was the increase in the traffic pressure of Tat Tung Road entirely through which buses of route no. B6 would go through. While a solution had been formulated in respect of queueing arrangement, the traffic pressure at Tat Tung Road was not addressed. At present, whether the increased

vehicular flow would create congestion could not be anticipated and the department did not explain how it would handle the problem.

- (b) Members proposed that after 10 February, the bus stop of NLB route no. B6 could be relocated to the new bus terminus at Citygate Phase II. If such relocation was not possible right after 10 February, he enquired whether the bus stop of route no. B6 bus stop would be moved back to its existing location or remain in its place after relocation until the commissioning of the new terminus.

10. Miss Sherman CHOI said that TD wished to reduce the impact on residents caused by the possible peak tourist season during LNY. If the new bus terminus could not be commissioned after 10 February, the department would consider extending the relevant arrangement or not depending on the co-ordination with various parties such as the bus company and the Police. After implementation of the temporary relocation arrangement, the department would review with various parties its effectiveness and the overall merits and demerits. Studies would also be conducted in respect of the necessity and feasibility of the arrangement before deciding whether it should be extended until the commissioning of the new bus terminus. TD was aware of Members' concerns about the long-term arrangement for the bus stop of route no. B6 and would consult the stakeholders in due course.

11. Ms YUEN Kit-fung made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding the impact on traffic at Tat Tung Road, while route no. B6 would route via the entire Tat Tung Road, thus increasing the traffic pressure thereat, the additional departures would not overload the road. However, other roadside activities, such as parking, loading/unloading activities or vehicles waiting for parking spaces would affect the traffic of Tat Tung Road.
- (b) As the bus stop relocation arrangement would be effective throughout the LNY, TD had discussed with the Police relevant arrangements and conducted an on-site inspection at the location of the temporary bus stop. The Police would deploy staff to maintain traffic and ensure pedestrian safety, and implement appropriate traffic arrangements as necessary.

12. Mr WONG Wah enquired of TD when the trunk pruning work of the 2 trees near the temporary bus stop would be completed.

13. Mr CHAN Tin-lung said that the entire Tat Tung Road was already very busy. After relocating the bus stop of route no. B6 to the location outside Tat Tung Road Public Toilet, attention had to be paid to whether other road users would be jeopardised. It was because NLB bus route no. B6 had high patronage and Mainland tourists tended not to follow rules and often jaywalked. He hoped that the plan was a temporary one and another site would be designated as the bus stop of route no. B6 permanently. He also noticed that after the commissioning of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Ground Transportation Centre and the implementation of crowd management, the pedestrian

flow reduced by a half or even more. As such, he opined that there was no need to set up a bus stop for route no. B6 at Tat Tung Road in a haste.

14. Miss Sherman CHOI made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) With regard to Mr WONG Wah's enquiry about pruning of tree trunks, she said that the department would follow up with LCSD as soon as possible after the meeting in order to ensure the safety of bus operation.
- (b) With regard to Mr CHAN Tin-lung's concern about the temporary bus stop relocation arrangement for route no. B6, she said that it was of a temporary nature. The long-term arrangement for the bus stop of route no. B6 could only be reviewed after the commissioning of the new bus terminus at Citygate. The department would timely consult the stakeholders after a plan was formulated.

15. Mr WONG Wah enquired whether the relocation arrangement would be implemented after completion of the pruning works when vehicular safety was assured.

16. Miss Sherman CHOI responded that after completion of the pruning works, representatives of the bus company would be invited to conduct on-site testing. Relevant arrangements would only be implemented after it was ensured that bus operation was safe and the traffic of Tat Tung Road would not be affected.

17. Ms Amy YUNG said that she raised an urgent agenda item about the attack on a bus driver at Discovery Bay North Plaza in the previous week. As the situation was serious, she requested the Chairman to approve discussion on the matter under "Any Other Matters". She also hoped that Mr Peter TSANG, representative of DBTSL would stay at the meeting to understand the matter.

18. The Chairman said that Members agreed to discuss the matter under "Any Other Matters".

19. The Chairman requested Members to confirm the minutes.

20. No amendment was proposed and the above minutes were endorsed unanimously.

21. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had drafted a checklist of matters for follow-up as at 18 January of the current year, which had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting. The relevant paper was tabled at the meeting.

(Mr Ken WONG joined the meeting at about 2:10 p.m.; Ms Sammi FU and Mr LAU Chin-pang joined the meeting at about 2:20 p.m.)

II. Universal Accessibility Programme for retrofitting of lift Across Ying Hei Road near the Visionary and Caribbean Coast (Structure No. ID01)
(Paper T&TC 1/2019)

22. The Chairman welcomed Mr YIU Chiu-chung, Senior Engineer 2/Universal Accessibility and Mr LEUNG Ho-kwun, Engineer 2/Universal Accessibility of the Highways Department (HyD) and Mr Martin CHEUNG, Deputy Managing Director and Mr Patrick CHONG, Project Engineer of the Mannings (Asia) Consultants Limited to the meeting to present the paper.

23. Mr YIU Chiu-chung briefly introduced the background of the item. Mr Patrick CHONG presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint presentation.

24. Mr Holden CHOW welcomed the implementation of the proposed retrofitting of a lift via the Universal Accessibility Programme in order to respond to long-term demand of residents. It was stated in the paper that the works schedule would be formulated according to the progress of gazetting. He enquired about the anticipated date of commencement and completion of the works after it was endorsed by the District Council (DC). In order to avoid causing noise nuisance to the residents, he proposed that contractors should avoid conducting works at night.

25. Mr YIP Pui-kei was pleased that the preliminary design for the project had been completed. He enquired about the specific schedule of the works, including procedures of tendering and gazetting. He learnt that the department had completed site investigation by 2018. He enquired whether the retrofitting of a lift would require relocation of underground pipes in advance and whether other difficulties would be encountered.

26. Mr YIU Chiu-chung appreciated Members' support for the project and pledged to implement the works as soon as possible. As HyD was not responsible for the maintenance of the footbridge to which the lift would be connected, gazetting under the Road (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance would still be required after the project was endorsed by DC. If objection was raised by any organisations or individuals, the matter had to be handled according to statutory procedures after gazetting. As the implementation of works would depend on the progress of gazetting, the department could not commit a schedule at present but pledged that the works would be commenced as soon as possible.

27. Mr Patrick CHONG said that the consultant initially estimated that it was unlikely construction be conducted at night but it would eventually depend on the arrangements of the contractor. If construction work at night was necessary, the parties concerned would ensure that relevant regulations and noise standards would be complied with. It was initially estimated that the underground utilities at the construction site would not affect the lift retrofitting works. Nevertheless, the site investigation contractor would still conduct a detailed site investigation to identify the actual position of underground utilities, which was anticipated to be carried out in the first or second quarter of 2019.

28. Mr FAN Chi-ping said that the works of retrofitting a lift at the footbridges at Chung Yan Road and Wong Ka Wai and 2 lifts at Mun Tung Estate commenced at the same time in 2013. The latter had been completed in haste after the intake of Mun Tung Estate, while the former had yet been completed to date. He opined that it was unreasonable to spend 6 to 7 years for retrofitting of lifts and requested the department to account for the slow progress of works.

29. Mr Holden CHOW was pleased to learn that it was unlikely for works to be conducted at night. Residents in the vicinity of the works site were affected by noise nuisance before so it was hoped that construction work at night could be avoided. He understood that it would be hard for the department to predict public response after gazetting and thus an accurate schedule could not be provided. However, he hoped that the department would provide an estimated works schedule based on past experience.

30. Mr LEE Ka-ho enquired about the time required for completing lift works of a similar nature in general and the anticipated completion date of the works concerned.

31. Mr YUEN King-hang enquired about the size of the lifts, their capacity and the number of wheelchairs and strollers they could accommodate.

32. Mr YIU Chiu-chung said that his section was not in charge of the lift retrofitting works at Chung Yan Road footbridge. According to information, the works involved relocation of underground utilities, thus increasing the construction difficulty. The works was anticipated to be completed in 2019. According to past experience, lift works of that type could generally be completed within 3 years.

33. Mr Patrick CHONG said that the lift in the project had the same specifications as those lifts constructed in other districts. They could accommodate 12 persons with an outer dimensions of 3.1 metres x 3.1 metres and inner dimensions of 1.5 metres x 1.4 metres.

34. Members supported the above project.

III. Question on request for provision of MTR fare saver at Mun Tung Estate in Tung Chung or interchange concession for New Lantau Bus route no. 39M
(Paper T&TC 2/2019)

35. The Chairman welcomed Ms Annie LAM, Public Relations Manager - External Affairs and Ms Jessica LEUNG, Senior Public Relations Executive - External Affairs of the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) and Mr WONG Wah, Administrative Consultant and Mr CHAN Tin-lung, Deputy General Manager of the New Lantau Bus Co.(1973) Limited (NLB) to the meeting to respond the question.

36. Mr Eric KWOK briefly presented the question.

37. Ms Annie LAM responded as follows:

- (a) Relevant interchange concessions were jointly provided by MTRCL and green minibuses (GMB). MTRCL would from time to time review the existing concessions, monitor the latest market situation and consider whether new concession schemes should be introduced.
- (b) All along, MTRCL had been providing different concessions to different groups of passengers according to their needs, such as Monthly Pass Extra and interchange discounts provided jointly with bus companies. MTRCL also discussed the feasibility of introducing concessions with various public transport service operators. At present, the interchange concession schemes jointly provided by MTRCL and bus companies covered a number of Lantau bus routes, including the one mentioned by Mr Eric KWOK earlier.
- (c) After listening to the views, MTRCL would pro-actively discuss with public transport service operators and report to Members when there was further information.

38. Mr CHAN Tin-lung said that NLB had been discussing relevant arrangements of the matter with MTRCL and would announce to the passengers as soon as possible once the scheme was decided to be implemented.

39. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He enquired whether NLB and MTRCL had been discussing the interchange concession of route no. 39M and a consensus was likely to be reached. He requested provision of a concrete concession period after the scheme was finalised. Furthermore, residents of Yat Tung Estate had been enjoying the interchange concession of NLB route no. 38 but those of Mun Tung Estate would only be benefited later on, which was unfair and might give rise to discontent among the residents.
- (b) He opined that since the concession scheme had been finalised, it should be implemented at the earliest possible time and any delay would be counterproductive. He hoped that an implementation schedule would be provided and the concession would be effective as soon as possible.

40. Mr LAU Chin-pang expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He was appreciative of the interchange concession provided by MTRCL and NLB. However, he could not understand why concession was provided for some routes only. Yat Tung Estate and Mun Tung Estate were not far apart. He queried why such a well-planned scheme was not implemented at the soonest possible time. As many tenants had moved into their flats in Mun Tung Estate, while some details required

further discussion, he hoped that relevant procedures could be expeditiously processed.

- (b) He said that the \$1 interchange concession had existed for many years. When NLB route no. 38 was introduced, the fare was \$3. However, the fare of NLB route nos. 37 and 38 had been increased so he enquired whether fares would be adjusted according to the situation or interchange concession be reviewed. Learning that MTRCL introduced interchange concession as profits were registered, he enquired whether some profits could be used as rebate for passengers such as increasing the amount of concession in line with fare increase.

41. Mr Holden CHOW hoped that MTRCL would respond to the demand of the residents and provide an MTR fare saver in Mun Tung Estate. At present, Tung Chung was developing rapidly and MTRCL recorded substantial profits. He hoped that MTRCL would provide MTR fare savers at Tung Chung town centre or even all over Tung Chung and provide concessions such as interchange concession to rebate the profits to the public.

42. Ms Annie LAM made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) MTRCL noted Members' views and would obtain further information from relevant Departments. For the arrangements of the interchange discount with NLB route no. 39M, as it involved technical details, MTRCL would report to Members as soon as possible once decision was made or when a concrete schedule was available.

(Post-meeting note: MTRCL would provide interchange concession for route no. 39M at the end of March. Passengers travelling to Tung Chung Station by MTR with Octopus could enjoy \$1 interchange discount if they took NLB route no. 39M within 90 minutes after passing through an exit gate.)

- (b) The purpose of providing MTR fare savers was to encourage members of the public to walk to the nearest MTR station to take MTR, which could help promote business and expand the passenger base. However, certain conditions had to be met. For example, the proposed location should not be too far from or too close to the nearest MTR station and it should have sufficient space and basic provisions such as electricity supply. Members could propose any sites to MTRCL and it would carefully study the suitability of the locations.
- (c) MTRCL would review whether adjustment to the amount of interchange discounts was necessary according to the market situation and discussions would be conducted with other operators.

43. Mr CHAN Tin-lung said that NLB would discuss with MTRCL the views of Members and provide the schedule concerned to Members as soon as possible.

(Post-meeting note: The interchange discounts of NLB route no. 39M and MTR would be effective from 25 March 2019.)

44. Mr Eric KWOK opined that the situation of Mun Tung Estate was relatively simple. There were only 4 residential buildings and the bus stop was outside the shopping mall in the middle. He proposed that a fare saver be provided outside 7-Eleven convenience store because the residents must walk past the site if they would like to take a bus to Tung Chung town centre for interchange to MTR. He requested the representatives of MTRCL to conduct on-site inspections with him but emphasised that provision of interchange concessions topped the agenda.

(Post-meeting note: The representatives of MTRCL conducted on-site inspection with Mr Eric KWOK at Mun Tung Estate in late February of the current year.)

(Mr Randy YU left the meeting at about 2:50 p.m.)

IV. Question on provision of MTR Tung Chung East Station (Paper T&TC 10/2019)

45. The Chairman welcomed Ms Annie LAM, Public Relations Manager - External Affairs and Ms Jessica LEUNG, Senior Public Relations Executive - External Affairs of MTRCL to the meeting to respond the question. The written replies of the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and MTRCL had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

46. Mr YIP Pui-kei briefly presented the question. He pointed out that it was stated in the written reply of MTRCL that the proposal of Tung Chung West Extension and Tung Chung East Station had been submitted to THB in January 2018. He enquired about the vetting progress of the proposal. At present, the reclamation works in Tung Chung East was progressing well and the Government anticipated earlier that intake of the first batch of residents could take place the earliest in 2022 or 2023. In case Tung Chung East Station could not be commissioned before resident intake, the overall traffic of Tung Chung would be affected. In addition, it was also stated in the written reply that the walking distance between the proposed location of MTR fare savers and the nearest MTR station should not be too long or too short. Provision of MTR fare savers in Tung Chung North, Caribbean Coast and Coastal Skyline, etc. had been proposed for several years, MTRCL had plenty sites to choose from. He urged MTRCL to provide fare savers as soon as possible.

47. Ms Annie LAM said that with regard to the progress of Tung Chung East Station, MTRCL had provided written reply and she had nothing to supplement. In respect of the proposal of providing MTR fare savers, Members with specific views on site selection could reflect them to MTRCL for further study.

48. Mr Holden CHOW expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He was dissatisfied with the failure to provide the schedule of completion of Tung Chung East Station in the written replies of THB and MTRCL. He had time and again enquired about the date of commission of Tung Chung East Station and the departments concerned replied that the station would be completed in 2026, whereas the Development Bureau (DEVB) anticipated that the intake of the first batch of residents would take place in 2023 the earliest. In other words, the first batch of residents had to wait for 3 years for the commissioning of Tung Chung East Station. He opined that the progress of planning of the station could not tie in with the needs of existing and future residents of Tung Chung and urged THB and MTRCL to provide a concrete schedule of commissioning of Tung Chung East Station as soon as possible.
- (b) As the population of Tung Chung was on the increase, he agreed with the proposal of providing more MTR fare savers raised by Mr YIP Pui-kei and hoped that it would be implemented as soon as possible.
- (c) MTRCL had said that it would make available the escalator near Tung Chung Station Exit A for public use in 2022. With the rise in population in Tung Chung, the pedestrian flow of Tung Chung Station kept increasing. He urged MTRCL to make available the escalator at Tung Chung Station Exit A for public use as soon as possible to divert the pedestrian flow.

49. Mr YIP Pui-kei said that at present, residents of Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West going to the urban area had to commute to Tung Chung town centre for interchange to MTR. The traffic of Tat Tung Road at Tung Chung town centre was very congested in the morning peak hours and the capacity of MTR Tung Chung Line was overloaded so increase in frequency was infeasible. In the future when the residents of Tung Chung East Reclamation Area moved in, the congestion would be beyond imagination. He hoped that THB and MTRCL would expedite the works progress of Tung Chung East Station and provide a concrete schedule of completion in order to ease Members' concerns.

50. Mr LEE Ka-ho expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He was disappointed at the written reply of MTRCL. The works of Tung Chung East Station commenced many years ago but the progress was slow. The date of completion had been postponed again and again and there was yet a schedule of completion. The government departments concerned had said that the completion of Tung Chung West Station would tie in with the resident intake date of Yat Tung Estate. The residents had moved into Yat Tung Estate for years but the works of Tung Chung West Station had not yet commenced. He enquired when the works would begin.

- (b) With regard to the request for provision of MTR fare savers, he said that housing estates including Coastal Skyline and Caribbean Coast in Tung Chung North were managed by MTRCL, and therefore he proposed that MTRCL should set up fare savers at the above locations.

51. Ms Sammi FU expressed her views as follows:

- (a) In 2015, she made an enquiry to DEVB about the construction schedule of Tung Chung East Station and was told that the station was anticipated to be completed in 2019 or 2020. However, in recent years, the bureau said that the anticipated completion date of the station would be postponed to 2026. The construction works of Tung Chung East Station was confirmed a dozen years or more ago when resident intake of housing estates in Tung Chung North began. However, its completion date had been repeatedly delayed and a concrete schedule of completion could not be provided to date. The population of Tung Chung was increasing, which aggravated traffic congestion. She hoped that THB and MTRCL would expedite the works progress of Tung Chung East Station.
- (b) MTR Fare savers were provided between most housing estates and their nearest MTR stations in the urban area even if the walking distance between them was long. Housing estates in Tung Chung North such as Caribbean Coast and Coastal Skyline were quite far from the MTR station in Tung Chung town centre and MTRCL should provide MTR fare savers in housing estates in Tung Chung as soon as possible.

52. Mr Eric KWOK said that according to the Railway Development Strategy 2014, the works of Tung Chung West Extension would commence in 2020 and be completed in 2024. However, the completion date of Tung Chung East Station was postponed repeatedly and THB did not mention the anticipated dates of works commencement and completion anymore. In the past few years, he had enquired MTRCL, THB and relevant government departments about the works schedule of Tung Chung West Extension many times but no concrete reply had been received. It was learnt that MTRCL submitted a works report to THB and HyD in 2018. He hoped that MTRCL would request the relevant government departments to commence works of Tung Chung West Extension and Tung Chung East Station as soon as possible in order to divert the ever-increasing pedestrian flow and mitigate traffic congestion in Tung Chung.

53. Mr LAU Chin-pang said that when he was young, he had heard about the plan of constructing Tung Chung West Station. However, a dozen years had passed but the works had not yet started. He hoped that MTRCL and the relevant government departments would listen to Members' views and commence works of Tung Chung West Extension and Tung Chung East Station as soon as possible in order to mitigate the traffic load of roads. He enquired MTRCL whether construction works of the 2 MTR stations would be "bundled" or conducted separately and proposed that priority be given to the site that had already fulfilled the requirements for construction.

54. Mr LOU Cheuk-wing said that many years ago, the Government said that Tung Chung would be developed into a town suitable for hundreds of thousands of people to live. As such, THB should conduct planning of ancillary facilities as early as possible in order to tie in with future development. However, over the years, the bureau conducted planning only according to the population of the time and the government measures were far from forward looking. In contrast, the Mainland and other places usually conducted planning early having regard to future development and concerned departments should follow the practice. It was stated in the written reply of THB that the Government would conduct public consultation according to mechanism on the specific alignment of the railway, the location of the station and implementation schedule before decisions related to Tung Chung Line Extension were made. He opined that most of the residents agreed with the construction of Tung Chung East Station so there was no need for the Government to conduct consultations. As Tung Chung Station was already very congested at present, he requested MTRCL to implement the works of Tung Chung West Station and Tung Chung East Station as soon as possible.

55. Miss Sherman CHOI said that THB had provided a written reply in response to Members' enquiries and the department had nothing to supplement at present.

56. The Chairman asked the Secretariat to relay Members' views and requests to THB after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat relayed Members' views and requests to THB.)

V. Question on the financial situation of Hong Kong Airlines
(Paper T&TC 3/2019)

57. The Chairman said that the Immigration Department, Civil Aviation Department and Hong Kong Airlines did not arrange representatives to attend the meeting, but had provided written replies for Members' perusal.

58. Mr YUEN King-hang briefly presented the question.

59. Mr Eric KWOK said that if members of the public were stranded overseas because airlines ceased operation suddenly, they would feel very helpless. The Government should take the opportunity to explain in detail how the Government and overseas Chinese embassies would assist stranded citizens to return to Hong Kong, rather than giving perfunctory replies and directing people in need to call hotline (852) 1868 for assistance. He was also doubtful whether one could get through the hotline from overseas.

VI. Question on Long Win Bus route no. S64
(Paper T&TC 4/2019)

60. The Chairman welcomed Miss Sherman CHOI, Senior Transport Officer/Islands1 of TD and Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of the Long Win Bus Company Limited (Long Win) to the meeting to respond the question. The written reply of Long Win had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

61. Mr LAU Chin-pang briefly presented the question and enquired whether the splitting of Long Win route no. S64 would be implemented around the clock or just during peak hours.

62. Miss Sherman CHOI said that the department had received the proposed amendments to the route splitting plan from Long Win and was studying and discussing the details, which could not be divulged at present. The department would consult DC in respect of the contents of the plan in due course.

63. Mr Rayson LAW said that views gathered had been incorporated into Bus Route Planning Programme (BRPP) 2019-2020 for further consultation.

64. Mr LAU Chin-pang said that Members had repeatedly proposed that Long Win should split route no. S64 in order to provide around-the-clock service, which would bring convenience to Tung Chung residents who worked in the catering area and passenger terminals at the Airport. If relevant measures could not be implemented immediately, he proposed that Long Win should implement the splitting arrangement in phases.

65. Mr Eric KWOK said that Members had requested splitting of Long Win route no. S64 many times and the same proposal was raised in the discussion of BRPP 2018-2019. With the completion of housing estates such as Mun Tung Estate and Yu Tai Court, the population of Tung Chung West kept increasing. He hoped that the department would confirm the schedule of route splitting in the BRPP 2019-2020.

66. Mr Holden CHOW said that with the completion of the third airport runway and the increase in population of Tung Chung, the authorities should study the construction of a light rail system connecting Tung Chung and the Airport, or extension of Tung Chung Line to the Airport in order to encourage residents to work in the area.

67. Miss Sherman CHOI said that the department noted Members' request for splitting the route for whole day service and would consider the views when it discussed the route proposal with Long Win.

VII. Question on Long Win Bus route no. E31 and New Lantau Bus route nos. 39M and B6
(Paper T&TC 5/2019)

68. The Chairman welcomed Miss Sherman CHOI, Senior Transport

Officer/Islands1 of TD; Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win; Mr Kevin LI, Public Affairs Manager and Mr Carson FUNG, Senior Operations Officer of the Citybus Limited (Citybus) and Mr WONG Wah, Administrative Consultant and Mr CHAN Tin-lung, Deputy General Manager of NLB to the meeting to respond the question. The written replies of Long Win and Citybus had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

69. Mr LAU Chin-pang briefly presented the question.

70. Miss Sherman CHOI said that regarding the proposal of splitting of Long Win route nos. E31 and E32A, approval had been given to Long Win to implement the relevant arrangements on 2 February of the current year. In addition, the department was following up on and studying the proposals to improve the service of route no. 39M, which were anticipated to be implemented in February. Citybus proposed in the BRPP that 4 “E” routes would divert via or extend to Mun Tung Estate. The department and Citybus would continue to closely monitor the progress of resident intake and demand of Mun Tung Estate and implement relevant arrangements in due course.

71. Mr Rayson LAW said that the arrangement of splitting route nos. E31 and E32A was just approved by TD and would be implemented on 2 February of the current year. Long Win would announce relevant details to passengers as soon as possible. As response had been given at the meeting earlier about the arrangements for bus route travelling from Mun Tung Estate to the Airport, he would not repeat them then.

72. Mr Kevin LI said that in order to tie in with the development of Tung Chung Area 39 and the needs of passengers, Citybus proposed in the BRPP that services of route nos. E11S, E21A, E21X and E22S be extended to the area, and that headway enhancement of route nos. E11S, E21A and E22S according to situation should be considered. Citybus would closely monitor the resident intake of Mun Tung Estate, the operation of various routes and the needs of passengers. Measures mentioned above were anticipated to be implemented in the first or second quarter of the current year.

73. Mr WONG Wah said that NLB planned to advance the first departure of route no. 39M to 6:10 a.m., whereas the last departure would be at 12:10 a.m. The route would operate at an interval of 15 to 25 minutes.

74. Mr Eric KWOK enquired whether the last departure of NLB route no. 39M would tie in with the last MTR train arriving at Tung Chung, and whether the bus would depart from Citygate.

75. Mr LAU Chin-pang thanked NLB for increasing the frequency of route no. 39M to tie in with the resident intake of Tung Chung Area 39. At present, the route did not provide overnight service. Residents of Mun Tung Estate going to the urban area at late night had to walk 20 to 30 minutes to Tung Chung Fire Station for buses, or take NLB route no. B6 which operated around the clock. However, the fare of route no. B6 was \$7, which almost doubled that of route no. 39M. Route no. B6 mainly carried passengers travelling to and from HZMB and its patronage was low at

late night. He therefore proposed that sectional fare be implemented on route no. B6 from Mun Tung Estate to Tung Chung MTR Station to benefit residents of Yat Tung Estate and Mun Tung Estate. If NLB accepted the proposal, it would not have to allocate additional resources to provide overnight service for route no. 39M and the excessive capacity of route no. B6 could be utilised.

76. Mr LEE Ka-ho expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He enquired Long Win about the frequency arrangements after splitting route nos. E31 and E32A on 2 February of the current year. At present, the patronage of most departures of route no. E31 was high. He was worried that the frequency of route no. E31 would be low after being split.
- (b) At present, residents of Tung Chung North could travel to Tsing Yi directly by taking route no. E31. However, after splitting, route no. E32A would not travel via Tsing Yi Station, which would reduce the number of buses travelling to Tsing Yi directly.
- (c) Just then various bus companies said that they might adjust or extend bus services according to the development of Mun Tung Estate and needs of passengers. However, there were often delays in bus trips in Tung Chung North, in particular those of Citybus route no. E21A in the morning, which affected residents commuting to work. He hoped that the relevant measures would not aggravate the situation of lost trips.

77. Mr YIP Pui-kei said that many residents of Tung Chung North worked or went to schools in Tsing Yi. However, after splitting route nos. E31 and E32A, route no. E31 would not travel via Tung Chung North, which would reduce the transportation choices of residents of Tung Chung North going to Tsing Yi. To his understanding, it was proposed in the BRPP of the previous year to maintain the service of route no. E32A at 20-minute intervals, and at 15-minute intervals for route no. E31. The population of Tung Chung North was approaching 40 000. He was worried that the existing level of service of route no. E32A could not meet residents' demand. He hoped that TD and Long Win would enhance the service of route no. E32A during peak hours to carry passengers to and from Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi.

78. Ms Sammi FU said that route no. E31 operated at an interval of 15 minutes in the morning and evening peak hours. However, many residents reflected that there were many passengers from 8:30 p.m. to 11:30 p.m. at weekends and the compartments were very crowded. Sometimes, passengers at Lantau Link Toll Plaza could not board even after waiting for several buses. She hoped that the department and Long Win would increase the frequency of route no. E31 to satisfy the transportation needs of the residents.

79. Mr WONG Wah said that NLB would review proposals of implementing sectional fare on route no. B6 and providing overnight service for route no. 39M, and would report to Members in due course.

80. Mr Rayson LAW made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) After splitting route nos. E31 and E32A on 2 February of the current year, Long Win would adjust service arrangements according to BRPP of Islands District 2017-2018. It would increase the frequency of departures from Tung Chung to Kwai Fong in morning peak hours to every 15 minutes according to the number of passengers of route no. E32A. Long Win would continue to monitor the operation situation after the splitting and rationalization of bus routes and review the level of service in due course.
- (b) Long Win understood the concern about the arrangements for transportation to Tsing Yi. Residents could transfer to route nos. E31 or E32 to Tsing Yi at Lantau Link Toll Plaza. Long Win and TD would continue to monitor the situation and review the service arrangements.
- (c) Regarding the waiting situation of bus route no. E31 at Lantau Link Toll Plaza at night during weekends, Long Win believed that route rationalisation could help diverge passengers going to Tung Chung North and Tung Chung West and the situation would improve.

81. Mr Kevin LI said that at the end of 2018, Citybus found that some buses travelling between the urban area and Tung Chung experienced service disruption and arrived at the bus stop in Yat Tung Estate late. Consequently, there were lost trips for buses of route no. E21A departing from that stop during 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. After Citybus conducted internal operational adjustment, the headway of route no. E21A became more stable. Citybus would continue to closely monitor the service of route no. E21A and ensure that the arrangement of service extension to Mun Tung Estate would not affect its headway reliability.

82. Mr LAU Chin-pang expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Long Win route no. E31 would not travel via Tung Chung North after splitting. He was worried that route no. E32A alone could not meet the demand of the residents. He enquired about the details of frequency arrangements of route no. E32A.
- (b) After Long Win's route splitting and rationalisation transportation choices to Tsing Yi of residents of Tung Chung North reduced. He hoped that Long Win would consider extending the service of route no. E32A to Tsing Yi. While the travelling time might be lengthened, more transportation choices could be provided for residents of Tung Chung North.

83. Mr Holden CHOW said that recently residents reflected to him the lost trips for route nos. E31 and E32A in morning peak hours. He hoped that the bus company could maintain frequency stability while enhancing its services.

84. Mr Eric KWOK enquired NLB again whether the last departure of route no. 39M could tie in with the arrival time of the last MTR train at Tung Chung.

85. Mr WONG Wah said that the last departure of route no. 39M would be at 12:10 p.m., while the last MTR train arrived at Tung Chung at 1:10 a.m. As such, the two could not tie in with each other.

86. Mr Eric KWOK said that he understood that NLB encountered difficulties in deploying manpower for provision of overnight services. However, he hoped that the company would consider adjusting the time of the last departure of route no. 39M, so that members of the public riding on the last MTR train could catch the last departure of route no. 39M.

87. Mr WONG Wah said that NLB noted the related proposals and would consider adjusting the time of the last departure of route no. 39M.

88. Mr Rayson LAW made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Long Win noted the proposals related to route nos. E31 and E32A. It would continue to monitor the operation situation after route rationalisation and review the level of service in due course.
- (b) Regarding the views on service extension of Long Win route no. E32A to Tsing Yi, according to observation, most passengers on Kwai Fong-bound buses of route no. E32A alighted in Tsuen Wan. If a stop for route no. E32A was provided in Tsing Yi, the journey to Tsuen Wan would be lengthened. As such, Long Win had reservation about the above-mentioned proposal.

89. Miss Sherman CHOI made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) TD noted the views related to service level of route nos. E31 and E32A and would closely monitor the changes in patronage after route splitting. If necessary, it would request the bus company to enhance its services to cater for passenger demand.
- (b) Regarding bus service between Tung Chung and Tsing Yi, the department and Long Win had studied arranging some bus routes such as route no. E32A to route via Tsing Yi in the morning. However, most passengers of route no. E32A alighted in Tsuen Wan. If buses of route no. E32A diverted via Tsing Yi, the journey to Tsuen Wan would be lengthened by more than 10 minutes, thus bringing negative impact on most passengers. As such, the department had reservation on the proposal about diversion of route no. E32A via Tsing Yi at the current stage. However, the department would continue to study other feasible options with Long Win and strike a balance between passengers' needs and overall interests to meet the demand of Tung Chung North residents.

- (c) The department would closely monitor the situation of lost trips and follow up timely with the bus company on erratic and inadequate bus service.

VIII. Question on request for bus companies to introduce or extend Monthly Pass Scheme
(Paper T&TC 6/2019)

90. The Chairman welcomed Miss Sherman CHOI, Senior Transport Officer/Islands 1 of TD; Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win; Ms Betsy LEUNG, Assistant Manager, Public Affairs of the Kowloon Motor Bus Co.(1933) Limited (KMB); Mr Kevin LI, Public Affairs Manager and Mr Carson FUNG, Senior Operations Officer of Citybus to the meeting to respond the question. The consolidated written reply of Long Win and KMB and the written reply of Citybus had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

91. Mr LEE Ka-ho briefly presented the question.

92. Miss Sherman CHOI said that the Government had all along encouraged public transport operators to determine reasonable fares according to their operation and financial status, socio-economic environment and the needs of passengers and introduce concessions to reduce the transportation expenditure of members of the public as far as possible. The route network, operational environment and financial status of public transport operators varied and providing fare concessions or not was their business decision, but the department would continue to encourage operators to provide concessionary plans such as monthly pass.

93. Ms Betsy LEUNG said that KMB noted Members' views, and would maintain close liaison with TD on matters of monthly pass.

94. Mr Rayson LAW said that Long Win noted Members' views, and would maintain close liaison with TD.

95. Mr Kevin LI said that the fares of the Citybus routes travelling between North Lantau and the Airport had remained the same since its commencement of service in 1998. Citybus also provided many fare concessions and therefore did not have plans to implement monthly pass concession at present. Citybus would continue to monitor the changes in operational environment.

96. Mr Holden CHOW said that there were interchange concessions for bus routes serving Tuen Mun and Yuen Long but none for those serving Tung Chung. He proposed that bus companies should provide similar fare concessions for passengers in Tung Chung and hoped that TD would strengthen communication with bus companies.

97. Mr LEE Ka-ho understood that bus companies faced certain difficulties in operation. However, he was still disappointed at their responses. The department said that it had all along encouraged bus companies to provide concessions so he

enquired what concrete measures there were in the previous year. Although the Government said that it was aware of the large amount of transport expenditure borne by members of the public living in remote areas, the “Public Transport Fare Subsidy Scheme” implemented earlier lacked targeted measures and was limited in effectiveness.

98. Miss Sherman CHOI said that fares of franchised buses were formulated according to the fare scale of the Public Bus Services Ordinance, which stipulate the highest fare to be collected to ensure that the bus fare would not exceed the prescribed level. Operators could provide fare concessions according to their own financial status. The department would pro-actively encourage bus companies to provide monthly pass concession under feasible conditions.

(Mr LAU Chin-pang left the meeting at about 3:40 p.m.)

IX. Question on replacement of overnight ferry service with overnight bus service in Discovery Bay
(Paper T&TC 7/2019)

99. The Chairman welcomed Mr LI Wai-fan, Edmond, Senior Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry 1 of TD and Mr Benjamin AU, Assistant District Officer (Islands)1 of IsDO to the meeting to respond the question. The written reply of IsDO had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

100. Ms Amy YUNG briefly presented the question.

101. Mr Edmond LI said that TD had earlier received an application from Discovery Bay Transportation Services Ltd, the current operator of the Central-Discovery Bay (DB) ferry route (the operator) for replacement of overnight service of “Central-DB” route by a new overnight residents’ service (RS) plying between Central and DB. It was noted that the operator had revised the service proposal after taking into consideration the views of the locals and submitted the revised proposal to the department in January this year. At present, the frequency of the DB ferry service was governed by the TD. The concerned operator had to seek approval from the TD before making any adjustment to the ferry service. Meanwhile, the TD was examining the subject application together with supporting information submitted, and the operator was requested to provide further supporting information regarding their revised proposal. In processing the application for service adjustment, the TD would take into account various factors, including but not limited to the patronage of the overnight sailings and the actual demand of the passengers, operating situation of the ferry service, financial situation and performance of the ferry operator, impacts on the residents, whether the proposed RS would be a practical alternative and the acceptability of the proposed service change to local residents, etc. Residents’ need would be the TD’s prime concern and the TD would maintain close communication with the concerned ferry operator and residents on the matter. He invited the representative of the operator to explain the revised proposal in detail.

102. Mr Peter TSANG responded as follows:

- (a) At the DB Passenger Liaison Group meeting in August 2018, a representative proposed to replace the overnight ferry services of low patronage with overnight bus service. After study, the operator reported the study of the proposal at the meeting of another liaison group meeting in October for discussion. As the proposal gained support at both meetings, the operator submitted the proposal to the DB City Owners' Committee (Owners' Committee) for further discussion and made an application to TD.
- (b) At the Owners' Committee meeting on 24 October 2018, the operator discussed the proposal with the members. According to the bus service proposal, the bus would depart from Central Pier No. 3 and call at Connaught Road Central, then with a fast routing via Western Harbour Crossing, West Kowloon Highway and Tsing Ma Bridge, etc. to DB, with a number of stops near the housing courts along Discovery Bay Road for picking up and dropping off passengers. The proposal to suspend the low patronage ferry services was mainly to reduce operating cost and stabilise fares for improving the sustainability of the ferry operation in the long term.
- (c) On frequency, it was proposed that the bus would be operated at an interval of an hour, which would be more frequent than the ferry service with sailings at one and a half hours' intervals. The proposed bus service would run along Discovery Bay Road with wider coverage than the original ferry service. The passengers would no longer be required to change to bus to get home.
- (d) A few days after the Owners' Committee meeting, Discovery Bay Transit Services Ltd (DBTSL) sent leaflets to the residents of DB, detailing the content of the proposal for their comments. To date, about 200 comments were received by DBTSL from residents via email and telephone. A majority of respondents supported the proposal and some gave their views on the content of the proposal.
- (e) After consolidating the opinions, the operator amended the proposal, including the departure time of the last ferry from Central to DB from the originally proposed 11:30 p.m. on weekdays and midnight at weekends to 12:30 a.m. on both weekdays and weekends. On special days such as Christmas Eve or New Year's Eve when higher patronage was expected, the operator would adjust the departure times of the last ferries according to the circumstances and apply to TD in advance for additional sailings. Many residents raised concerns over ferry fare and the operator proposed to lower the fare from \$42 to \$38. The amended proposal had been submitted to TD for consideration. Regarding the sanitation facility which some residents had expressed concern, the operator proposed at the Owners' Committee meeting that the toilets in waiting area of Central

Pier 3 would remain open for overnight bus passengers' use.

- (f) Quite a number of residents sent email saying that after perusal of the leaflets issued by DBTSL, they had a better understanding about the proposed option and had reconsidered their own views. A Village Owners' Committee representative said in an email that the residents of his village, after receiving the leaflets, discussed the proposal during the meeting and were unanimous in the support of the proposal. The operator submitted the comments along with the ferry schedule and fare adjustments to TD for consideration. It was believed the amended proposal would cater for the needs of the majority of residents.

103. Mr Benjamin AU said that IsDO had explained in the written reply the existing consultation mechanism. The representative of TD had also mentioned just now that the application was being considered according to the established mechanism with all relevant factors taken into account. If IsDO was requested to arrange a local consultation after TD's preliminary review, it would do so according to the prevailing mechanism.

104. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) The Passenger Liaison Group mentioned by Mr Peter TSANG was formed with members nominated by the chairmen of the Village Owners' Committee. She was not a member of the Passenger Liaison Group but she attended to observe the proceedings of every meeting. According to her observation, 1 to 2 members raised topics for discussion at the meetings and the atmosphere was not as serious as that of District Council (DC) meetings. As a result, some items were put to vote while the residents were not yet clear about the details. The current representatives of the Passenger Liaison Group were mostly property owners but a majority of them were non-residents. To increase transparency, she hoped the Passenger Liaison Group could invite residents to participate so that those affected by the proposal could make their views known.
- (b) She only noted the proposal 8 days before the Owners' Committee meeting, which was held on 24 October 2018. Ahead of the said meeting, she convened a meeting in the village she lived in, at which a representative remained neutral while the rest opposed the proposal. Therefore, she asked the Vice-Chairman to attend the Owners' Committee meeting and raise objection to the proposal.
- (c) According to the Deed of Mutual Covenant, property owners could not raise any objection to the decisions of the Owners' Committee. If an item was endorsed by a majority vote of the Owners' Committee, she could not make a consultation even if she objected to the endorsement. Therefore, she could only conduct a questionnaire survey in the capacity of a DC Member. Mr Peter TSANG mentioned that a questionnaire

survey had been conducted on the proposal by the operator. In her opinion, the questionnaire was pre-set and the proposal was expected to be endorsed at the Owners' Committee meeting, so the operator could distribute the questionnaires the next day after the meeting. According to Mr Peter TSANG, many residents supported the proposal after reading the questionnaires but it was not the case. Residents misunderstood that the proposal had been confirmed after receiving the questionnaires. They did not know the proposal was not yet endorsed until she conducted another survey. Since DC Members were not allowed to deliver letters directly to the post boxes of DB residents, the questionnaires had to be distributed via the post office, coupled with the printing time, the residents received the questionnaires only almost 2 weeks later.

- (d) Around 1 000 email and written responses to the questionnaire survey had been received and 90% of the respondents were against the proposal of the operator. To protect the privacy of the residents, she had to spend a few days consolidating their views before submitting the result to TD. The views of the respondents could be summarised into the following: First, the journey time of the proposed bus route was less than 1 hour according to the operator but it was over 1 hour according to information online, longer than that of the ferry service. Second, it was possibly dangerous for double-decker buses to travel on Cheung Tung Road at night and the ferry service would be relatively safer. Third, passengers of the overnight ferry service were mostly professionals working in Central or Wan Chai who were unwilling to wait for buses on the street after work at around 11:00 or 12:00 p.m. Lastly, the possibility of encountering drunk passengers on buses was higher at night. As bus compartments were limited in space and drivers could not maintain order when driving, the residents were concerned about the danger of riding on the same bus with drunk passengers.
- (e) The Owners' Committee told her that there was insufficient time for consultation after receiving the proposal, which was endorsed shortly afterwards. A number of residents were dissatisfied with the way the operator handled the matter regardless of their views. She hoped the operator could reserve sufficient time for consultation with the residents on the updated proposal so that they were better informed and could express their viewpoints.
- (f) She opined that the existing consultation mechanism of IsDO tended to tilt towards the Owners' Committee, as 7 votes were held in the hands of developers in the Owners' Committee. She was concerned that the Village Owners' Committee election of the 16 villages would be manipulated. Malpractices were discovered in the recent Village Owners' Committee election and were reported to the Police for handling. In the past, some authorisation letters for election were found to be misused and falsified in an attempt to cast a vast amount of votes for specific candidates. The Police said that it was a criminal offence but

no one was arrested due to insufficient evidence. She also mentioned at previous meetings that her email account had been intruded by hackers and her identity was used fraudulently to support developers at the consultation activities of Planning Department, and she hoped that the government departments would understand the situation of DB. She urged IsDO to review the existing mechanism and that it should take a share of responsibility if the decisions of the Owners' Committee were manipulated. For issues affecting the interests of residents of the area, she would conduct consultations to reflect the views of residents genuinely.

- (g) She opined that the Owners' Committee should not be chaired by non-DB resident nor non-property owner. Moreover, the management office should assist in handling matters with professional attitude to avoid discontent from the residents. She said that most DB residents were professionals and were not easily deceived, and hoped that all parties would be law-abiding and handle matters under the principles of lawfulness, reasonableness and fairness as well as respect the public views.

105. Mr Peter TSANG clarified that the operator had not conducted any survey. The leaflets distributed to the residents set out the proposal in detail and gathered views from them. Around 200 written comments were received, mainly by email. After consolidation, the operator noted that the majority of residents accepted the proposal. It then presented the amended proposal to TD for consideration after studying the relevant details and estimation.

106. Mr Benjamin AU emphasised that IsDO had all along been conducting local consultations in an impartial manner. As stated in the written reply, under the existing mechanism, the lead department would specify the consultees and scope and form of consultation when requesting IsDO to arrange a local consultation. If consultees were not specified by the lead department, IsDO would normally consult DC Members of the area and the resident representatives and/or organisations concerned. The list of consultees and returns received would be presented to the lead department for consideration upon completion of the consultation. Meanwhile, apart from participating in local consultations arranged by IsDO at the request of the lead department, Members and the residents might also raise their views to the lead department directly.

107. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) In respect of Mr Peter TSANG's claim that the transport company distributed leaflets but not questionnaires, she said that the leaflets were sent to the post boxes of residents the day after the Owners' Committee meeting. The email address and phone number via which the public could reflect their views were printed inconspicuously on the leaflets and so members of the Owners' Committee might not know the leaflet served consultation purpose. In addition, some seniors told her that someone

canvassed support for the proposal at elderly centres. As the proposal mainly affected residents who were working but not the seniors of elderly centres, she doubted the effectiveness in reflecting public views. Most representatives of the Owners' Committee were property owners of DB of whom the majority were non-residents and merely acted as "voting machines". She hoped government departments would understand that consultation results would be affected by consultees to a certain degree.

- (b) As mentioned by Mr Benjamin AU, IsDO consulted DC Member of the area as well as resident representatives and/or organisations concerned including the Owners' Committee according to the existing mechanism. However, the developers and Chairmen of the Village Owners' Committee held 7 and 16 votes respectively in the Owners' Committee, implying that they could influence decision making, for instance ferry and bus fare increase and the re-routing of ferry services via Disneyland at weekends, which were endorsed. Quite a number of residents had enquired about the identity and duties of the representatives but their requests were turned down on grounds of privacy and confidentiality. She hoped government departments would understand that consultees should be residents of the area.
- (c) She said that DB resident representatives or organisations were manipulated by developers and the DC Member concerned often encountered difficulties when conducting consultations in the area. She hoped that sufficient time would be given by relevant government departments for consultations to gather views from DB residents in future. With regard to the said proposal, she had received around 1 000 responses and submitted over 500 pages of feedback to TD after consolidation.
- (d) As representatives of IsDO would attend some elections and meetings of the Owners' Committee, she believed that manipulation of the meetings had been noticed and hoped that government departments would deal with the issue seriously.

108. Mr Peter TSANG responded as follows:

- (a) At the Owners' Committee meeting on 24 October 2018, the operator said that the proposal had to be submitted to TD for consideration even after it was endorsed at the meeting. The department would launch a public consultation after reviewing the proposal to provide an avenue for all DB residents and other members of the public to express their views.
- (b) The operator received around 200 written comments in non-specific format from residents. Residents could express their views freely and leave their contact details. The operator would explain the proposal to community organisations and bodies as necessary but not "canvassing" support. After consolidating the comments received, it was found that

support from residents was not overwhelming. Although the views received showed the majority were in favour of the proposal, some residents hoped for amendment of the details. For instance, with reference to the comments that some people were unwilling to wait for buses on the street after work, the operator had explained that a bus stop would be provided on Connaught Road Central in the future, which would be more convenient than the bus stop at Central Pier. He opined that the operator could consult residents on the proposal after more detailed information was provided. As such, the views collected would be more comprehensive.

109. Mr Edmond LI responded as follows:

- (a) TD was reviewing the information submitted by the operator for the application. He emphasised that the department would take into account various factors when processing the application, including the patronage and actual passenger demand of the overnight ferry service, impact of the proposal to the residents and operating situation of the operator, etc.
- (b) Subject to the supplementary information for substantiating the revised proposal, TD would arrange to conduct local consultation through District Offices as according to the established practice as in the past to collect public views. Besides, TD had duly noted and would take into consideration of members' views about the consultation period.

110. Mr Benjamin AU responded as follows:

- (a) With regard to Ms Amy YUNG's views on the composition of the Owners' Committee, he said that IsDO would submit the list of consultees and results to the lead department for consideration after consultation, irrespective of the voting result of the Owners' Committee. TD had noted the views of Ms Amy YUNG and other residents and he believed relevant views would be considered in a holistic manner.
- (b) Regarding the sufficiency of consultation period, IsDO was willing to arrange accordingly if TD considered that a longer consultation period would still tie in with their work schedule.

111. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She opined that the operator replaced overnight ferry service with overnight bus service in order to save cost as the large vessel in use consumed more fuel. She suggested the operator consider using solar-powered vessels and arranging small vessels to provide overnight ferry service, which would be more environmentally-friendly and cost-effective.

- (b) She had requested access to the voting results of issues that had stirred controversy according to the Code on Access to Information but only obtained the list of consultees eventually. As the list of consultees mainly consisted of members of the Owners' Committee, she reckoned that the consultation results tended to support the proposals of the Owners' Committee. Given that the existing consultation mechanism failed to collect public views genuinely, she had no choice but to consult over 8 000 households of DB and collect their views as a DC Member. She hoped that the department concerned would allow sufficient time for appropriate and thorough consultations.

112. Mr Benjamin AU said that according to the existing consultation mechanism, IsDO would relay views collected during the consultation period to the lead department for consideration. It was believed that the lead department, after receiving the views, would not adopt the proposal simply because it gained majority support. As mentioned by the representative of TD, the department had not yet requested IsDO to arrange a consultation for the issue and when a request was made for arranging a consultation in the future, he believed that the department would take into account Ms Amy YUNG's views.

X. Question on temporary village vehicle permit
(Paper T&TC 8/2019)

113. The Chairman welcomed Miss SIN Kai-wai Marie, Senior Transport Officer/Islands2 of TD to the meeting to respond the question.

114. Mr Ken WONG briefly presented the question.

115. Miss Marie SIN said that at present, the department would only consider issuing temporary village vehicle permits (temporary permit) to village vehicles for specified use, such as to local or charitable organisations for non-profitable or non-commercial use, and to public works or service contractors for public works or service, etc. Owners of village vehicles could apply for temporary permits from the department for the specified uses above. Regarding the application for temporary permits, the department would consider a basket of factors, including vehicles' usage, construction, route and time of operation. The impact of the application on other road users and community environment in the area would also be taken into account. The department would consult relevant departments, including views from locals. If objections were received in the consultation process, the department might request the applicant to provide more information for further review. Conditions would be imposed in the temporary permit, such as setting out that the village vehicle could only be used for the designated works contract but not others.

116. Mr Ken WONG expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Many government departments outsourced public services, such as refuse disposal. It was learnt that the contractor in charge could handle more

than 10 tons of refuse with only 2 village vehicles. On Peng Chau, it was learnt that the former contractor handled about 200 to 300 kilograms of bottles every day with only 1 village vehicle before 1 October 2018, but the new contractor applied temporary permits for 2 village vehicles, of which he queried the necessity. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) even said that it would not regulate the 2 village vehicles.

- (b) There were 17 village vehicles in the district at present. TD approved the operation of village vehicles on Saturdays and Sundays and at once approved 2 temporary permits, increasing the number of village vehicles in the district by more than 10%. He enquired how TD would regulate these village vehicles. Government departments outsourced a large amount of public services to contractors which could apply for renewal of licenses on the pretext of provision of public services. Temporary permits were then extended indefinitely and lost its temporary sense.
- (c) He opined that contractors should have considered the issue of transportation when submitting tenders and should not apply for temporary permits on grounds of undertaking departmental works. TD had convened meetings to review the arrangements for issuance of temporary permits. However, many temporary permits were issued in an unrestricted manner, which contradicted the original purpose. If the relevant departments opined that contractors needed to use village vehicles, the contractors should apply through the works department concerned because only departments were monitored by the public. There were media reports about EPD's ineffective supervision of outsourced contractors, and therefore he was concerned about the regulation of the 2 village vehicles.

117. Ms Josephine TSANG said that the department had mentioned that the reason for not issuing permit anymore was the excessive number of village vehicles. However, it then approved the operation of 2 village vehicles on Peng Chau because of works needs. There were already 17 village vehicles on Peng Chau and no more could be accommodated. She agreed that contractors should have considered the issue of transportation when submitting tenders and should not apply for temporary permits on grounds of undertaking departmental works. The department indicated that it would not regulate outside village vehicles. However, drivers of outside village vehicles were not familiar with the geographical environment of Peng Chau and some might have inappropriate attitude, thus courting danger. She enquired which department was responsible for regulating outside village vehicles.

118. Mr CHAN Lin-wai said that Lamma Island faced similar issues. Contractors set up many subsidiaries and the subsidiaries applied for temporary permits in the name of EPD or the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department. He opined that government departments should not apply for temporary permits on behalf of tenderers. Furthermore, they should not shirk the responsibility of supervising and allow the

contractors to use the village vehicles for non-specified uses. He requested the department to review the arrangements for issuing temporary permits again.

119. Mr Eric KWOK said that in rural areas such as Peng Chau and Cheung Chau, pedestrians and vehicles used the same road. As such, there was a need to regulate the use of diesel village vehicles or village vehicles generating noise on roads for the safety of the residents. Information papers of 2005 and 2008 revealed that the department agreed to suspend the issuance of village vehicle permits due to the excessive number of village vehicles. However, the department allowed contractors to apply for temporary permits under all sorts of pretext. He hoped that the department would make good use of existing licenses to meet the demand of the area and consult DC Members of the constituency areas, Rural Committees or the relevant organisations in respect of applications for issuance of additional licenses.

120. Miss Marie SIN said that the department noted Members' views on temporary permit, and made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Temporary permits could only be used for specified uses. The department would consider the operational need in assessing the application. The department was processing the application for temporary permit on Peng Chau and would consider the case in detail based on the information submitted by the applicant.
- (b) If applicants needed to operate village vehicles outside permitted hours, relevant details had to be stated on application documents and the department would assess the impact of the application.
- (c) Temporary permits would be valid for a period of not more than one year. If the holder of a temporary permit would need to use the village vehicle after the expiry date of the permit, application for renewal had to be submitted to the department. Upon receipt of application, the department would consider factors such as the duration of contract, and whether the village vehicle had been involved in an offence convicted under the Ordinance or regulations; or contravention of permit condition since the permit was issued. If a temporary permit was applied for public works, the permit condition would stipulate that the village vehicle could only be use for such purpose.

121. Mr Ken WONG expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He agreed that there was genuine need to apply for temporary permit for public works for short-term use. However, temporary village vehicles transporting bottles on Peng Chau were not regulated. Contractors kept applying for renewal, making temporary permits almost permanent. Temporary village vehicles were even used for non-specified uses.
- (b) Many government contractors applied for temporary permits with the

contracts of successful tenders and used them for commercial purpose. He agreed with the issuance of temporary permits to charity organisations for charity, non-profit or non-commercial uses but hoped that the department would review the arrangement for issuance of temporary village vehicle permits in 2002 and 2008 again and report to Members.

122. Mr CHAN Lin-wai said that the appearance of village vehicles with temporary permit was the same as privately owned village vehicles. Some village vehicles, after serving the purposes specified in the application made with contractual works, were used for other private uses, such as transportation of inert construction material and furniture. He had written to TD to propose that the department should request the name of company be shown on the rear of village vehicles with temporary permit, so that residents on the island could identify the nature and uses of the vehicles. He requested the department to take measures to prevent abuse of temporary permits and review again the arrangement for issuance of temporary permits.

123. Miss Marie SIN said that at present only owners of village vehicles could apply to the department for a temporary permit directly. She had noted Members' proposal of application of temporary permit by relevant government departments on behalf of vehicle owners. Overall speaking, regarding applications for temporary permits, the department would assess the applications based on their necessity, operation time and safety, etc.

124. Mr Ken WONG said that it was in 2002 that the department reviewed the arrangement for issuance of temporary permits for the last time. Seventeen years had passed and the use of village vehicles had caused many problems in Islands District. Recently, some Members of the Legislative Council pointed out that village vehicles posed risks to the resident of Islands District s. He hoped that the department would review the arrangement for issuance of temporary permits again.

125. Miss Marie SIN said that the department noted Members' views and would review in due course.

XI. Question on alleviating the congestion at Tat Tung Road, Tung Chung
(Paper T&TC 9/2019)

126. The Chairman welcomed Miss Sherman CHOI, Senior Transport Officer/Islands1 of TD; Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win; Mr Kevin LI, Public Affairs Manager and Mr Carson FUNG, Senior Operations Officer of Citybus and Mr WONG Wah, Administrative Consultant and Mr CHAN Tin-lung, Deputy General Manager of NLB to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of Long Win and Citybus had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

127. Mr Holden CHOW briefly presented the question.

128. Miss Sherman CHOI said that as the new bus terminus at Citygate would commission shortly, the department was reviewing with franchised bus companies including Long Win, Citybus and NLB on the usage and boarding and alighting arrangements of all bus termini in Tung Chung town centre, including Tung Chung Station Bus Terminus, Tung Chung Temporary Bus Terminus and the new bus terminus at Citygate. The department and all bus companies noted views regarding the diverging of bus routes calling at the bus stop outside Tung Chung Cable Car Terminals. Before considering various diverging measures, the department would assess the impact of boarding and alighting arrangements at the bus stop on passengers, the changes in overall journey time of routes concerned and whether the waiting environment and facilities of alternative stops could tie in with operational needs, etc. It would also study the feasibility of the relevant proposals with bus companies.

129. Mr Rayson LAW briefly presented the written reply of Long Win. Mr Kevin LI then presented the written reply of Citybus.

130. Mr CHAN Tin-lung said that the bus stop outside Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal was the major interchange for bus routes in the area. After the commissioning of the new bus terminus at Citygate, NLB would discuss the usage and boarding and alighting arrangements of all bus termini in Tung Chung town centre with TD and other franchised bus companies.

131. Mr Holden CHOW said that stops of many bus routes were set up outside Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal and the pavement besides was narrow. As such, it was very crowded at peak hours. He proposed that some bus routes be relocated to the new bus terminus at Citygate to diverge buses and passengers and ease the crowdedness.

132. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The third runway of the Airport, HZMB, Tung Chung West New Town and Greater Bay Area all brought heavy passenger and vehicular flow to Tung Chung. According to the early planning paper of HZMB, the bridge could accommodate the passing of 14 400 vehicles per day. Tat Tung Road was designed years ago as a two-lane one-way road and would not be able to cope with the increased vehicular flow and congestion would often occur. With the further increase in vehicular flow, Tat Tung Road would be overloaded. He proposed the setting up of a working group to discuss mid-term and long-term improvement measures and hoped that relevant departments would study the widening of Tat Tung Road. At present, the utilisation rate of the bicycle parking spaces behind Citygate was low so he proposed using the spaces as the stop for bus routes including NLB route no. B6.
- (b) At present, after entering Tat Tung Road, vehicles could only leave through the only exit and travel to North Lantau Highway via Shun Tung Road and Yu Tung Road. He proposed that a road connecting to Yu Tung Road should be built at the car park behind the health centre in Fu Tung Estate, through which vehicles at Tat Tung Road could go to

North Lantau Highway and the urban area without routeing via Yu Tung Road.

133. Mr YIP Pui-kei said that the pavement near the bus stop outside Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal was narrow. Passengers had to make their way through the crowd to go to the stop. The carriageway was also congested and buses had to wait for several minutes before pulling in at the stop. If no improvement was made, congestion and the problem of lost trips at Tat Tung Road would be more and more serious. He proposed that the department and bus companies should conduct a site inspection at Tat Tung Road with Members in order to understand the situation and discuss improvement measures.

134. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that as most routes travelling via Tung Chung town centre would pass Tat Tung Road, thus the traffic at the bus stops outside Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal and Tat Tung Road was very busy. The commissioning of HZMB, route no. B6, Citygate Phase II that was nearly completed and new Tung Chung Municipal Market under planning which would increase vehicular flow in the area and also the traffic load of Tat Tung Road. Representatives of bus companies had just mentioned that after the completion of the new bus terminus at Citygate Phase II, they would study rearrangement of the location of stops of various bus routes. However, most bus routes had to route via Tat Tung Road. Even if the stops of some bus routes were relocated to the bus terminus at Citygate, congestion at Tat Tung Road would not be alleviated. He proposed widening Tat Tung Road to ease congestion.

135. Mr WONG Wah said that bus stop outside Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal was the interchange for many NLB and "E" route buses. Regarding the request for bus stop relocation, he enquired Members whether there were feasible sites for relocation.

136. Mr CHAN Kam-hung expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The design of Tat Tung Road was faulty. After many repairs and relocation of stops of some bus routes, the issue remained unresolved. The exit of Lantau taxi stop was also accident-prone, drivers had to be mindful of the speedy traffic from Cheung Tung Road and Tat Tung Road and jaywalkers when driving out. Many accidents had occurred at the location but improvement was yet to be made.
- (b) Buses of Long Win and Citybus often arrived at the stop at the same period of time. He proposed that bus companies should adjust the schedule to scatter the arrival time of buses evenly to ease the congestion at Tat Tung Road.
- (c) He proposed that the gate connecting Tung Chung East Interchange and Cheung Tung Road be widened to allow traffic from Cheung Tung Road to go directly to the Airport, South Lantau and the urban area via Tung Chung East Interchange in order to reduce the traffic load of Tat Tung Road.

137. Mr Holden CHOW expressed his views as follows:

- (a) As many stops of many bus routes were provided at Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal, he understood that the department and bus companies had to carefully consider various diverging measures. After completion of Citygate Phase II, there would be one more indoor bus terminus located near the Tung Chung Temporary Bus Terminus and should effectively utilised. He hoped that the relevant department would provide a concrete option for Members to discuss in order to arrive at a suitable long-term solution to traffic congestion at Tat Tung Road.
- (b) As Tat Tung Road was narrow, he agreed that the bicycle parking spaces behind Citygate should be altered into a bus stop or for other uses to ease congestion at Tat Tung Road, and hoped that the department would consider and follow up on the proposal.

138. Ms YUEN Kit-fung made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The department had all along closely monitored the traffic condition of Tat Tung Road. When handling a new development project in the area, the Government would invariably request the proponents to conduct traffic impact assessment and provide mitigation proposals. Even if the remaining vehicular capacity was able to cope with the extra traffic brought about by the new development project, factors such as activities on the road and roadside and vehicles waiting would affect the traffic condition of Tat Tung Road. The department appreciated Members' views, and would continue to closely to monitor the traffic condition of Tat Tung Road.
- (b) Discussions had been conducted in the past about alteration of the 500 bicycle parking racks under the footbridge of Citygate as vehicle parking spaces or for other uses. However, new housing estates in Tung Chung gradually completed and there was a certain demand for bicycle parking racks. As there was no suitable site near Tung Chung Station for providing bicycle parking spaces, the department would have to carefully consider the proposal of altering the bicycle parking racks above. The department would continue to monitor the usage of bicycle parking racks and the traffic condition of Tat Tung Road.

139. Miss Sherman CHOI said that in reviewing the arrangements of the bus termini at the town centre, the department and bus companies would altogether consider the proposal of diverging bus routes at stops near Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal, congestion at the bus stops and the impact of related measures on bus operation and passengers. The department noted Members' views, and would continue to follow up on the matter with bus companies.

140. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) In early years when consultation was conducted on the alteration of bicycle parking spaces under the footbridge of Citygate, problems such as heavy traffic brought about by HZMB, long queues for NLB route no. B6 travelling between Tung Chung and the Hong Kong Port of HZMB, the rapid increase in population of Tung Chung and many “E” and “A” route buses going through Tung Chung had not existed, and therefore the proposal was rejected. However, the development of Tung Chung in recent years was rapid and new problems emerged. He urged the departments concerned to carefully consider the situation and resolve the traffic problem of Tung Chung as soon as possible.
- (b) He proposed that bicycle parking racks and cycle track under the footbridge of Citygate be used for other purposes, such as road widening or be altered as a bus stop or tourist coach parking spaces. Regarding the demand of residents of Tung Chung for bicycle parking racks, he proposed providing bicycle parking racks at the empty spaces near the public toilet, NLB bus stop or garden. There was a cycle track near Tung Chung New Development Pier. If the bicycle parking racks were relocated there, members of the public would be encouraged to ride bicycles to Tung Chung New Town.
- (c) He requested the department to study widening the gate linking Tung Chung East Interchange and Cheung Tung.
- (d) He proposed the construction of a new road connecting to Yu Tung Road at the car park behind the health centre in Fu Tung Estate, so that vehicles at Tat Tung Road could travel to North Lantau Highway and the urban area via the new road without routeing via Yu Tung Road.

141. Ms Josephine TSANG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) The bus stop outside Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal was very busy and the pavement there was very narrow. During peak hours, many buses pulled in at the stop and there were many passengers waiting. Once she was blocked and failed to board a bus and had to wait for more than 10 minutes for the next bus. She proposed that TD should conduct on-site inspection during peak hours from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at Tat Tung Road to understand the road condition.
- (b) The utilisation rate of the bicycle parking racks under the footbridge of Citygate was low but the department refused to alter it for other uses. She hoped that the department would consider Members’ views and altered the bicycle parking racks for other uses.

142. Ms Amy YUNG said that the traffic of Tat Tung Road was very busy. She proposed that buses in Discovery Bay should travel directly to Cheung Tung Road from Tung Chung MTR Station Exit B without routeing via Tat Tung Road in order to reduce the vehicular flow at Tat Tung Road. Occupants had been gradually moving in the

housing estates in Tung Chung. She hoped that the department would take measures to ease congestion at Tat Tung Road and explore long-term solutions to thoroughly resolve the traffic issue of Tat Tung Road.

143. Mr YIP Pui-kei said that there was a cycle track near the bus stop outside the swimming pool at Tat Tung Road. He proposed that the department should assess the usage rate of the cycle track in order to consider whether it should be removed for bus stop extension. Members had proposed many years ago improving the traffic condition of Tat Tung Road but the issue remained unresolved. In recent years, large-scale infrastructure projects and new housing estates in Tung Chung District were completed one after another and Tat Tung Road became busier and busier. He proposed that the department should study improvement measures as soon as possible.

144. Ms YUEN Kit-fung made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) When buses queued for pulling in at the bus stop outside the swimming pool at Tat Tung Road, the end of the queue might extend to the junction of Shun Tung Road and Tat Tung Road, which was the junction ahead of the bus stop. The Civil Engineering and Development Department would conduct improvement works to build a left-turn lane to Tat Tung Road at the junction in order to improve the traffic from Shun Tung Road to Tat Tung Road. The works was anticipated to be completed in the middle of the current year.
- (b) The department noted the views of altering bicycle parking racks under the footbridge of Citygate into bus parking spaces or for other uses.
- (c) Tung Chung East Extension Project included a new road extending Ying Hei Road to Tai Ho and a traffic interchange connecting Tung Chung New Town, North Lantau Highway and Cheung Tung Road would be provided.
- (d) The department noted Members' concern about the traffic condition of Tat Tung Road. It would review the proposals of Members and report to them in due course.

145. Mr CHAN Kam-hung hoped that Long Win and Citybus could give response to the proposal of adjusting the schedule of bus arrival.

146. Mr Rayson LAW said that Long Win noted the proposal of adjusting the bus arrival schedule. In formulating schedules, apart from vehicular flow, the riding pattern of passengers had to be considered as well in order to tie in with their transportation needs. Long Win route "E" buses travelling via Tat Tung Road mainly departed from the Airport. Even if adjustments were made to the bus departure schedule, boarding and alighting of passengers and traffic lights would all have impact on the journey time. As such, buses might not arrive at Tat Tung Road at the anticipated time.

147. Mr Kevin LI responded as follows:

- (a) Citybus altogether had 8 daytime routes travelling via the bus stop outside Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal. Citybus would adjust their departures according to the needs of passengers in different time sessions, for example a more frequent headway of 10 to 15 minutes during peak hours from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
- (b) The bus stop outside Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal was the eighth to tenth stop of route “E” buses after its departure from the terminus. Their arrival time depended on the traffic condition, traffic light and boarding and alighting of passengers. The frequency would be higher during peak hours, resulting in overlapping arrival time of some departures at the bus stop.

XII. Question on proposed service extension of green minibus route no. 901 to Passenger Terminal Building of the Airport
(Paper T&TC 11/2019)

148. The Chairman welcomed Miss Sherman CHOI, Senior Transport Officer/Islands 1 of TD and Mr YIP Ho-yeung, Administration Manager of the Coronet Ray Development Limited (Coronet Ray) to the meeting to respond to the question.

149. Mr YIP Pui-kei briefly presented the question.

150. Mr YIP Ho-yeung responded as follows:

- (a) The existing service level of GMB route no. 901 was able to meet the demand of passengers. As the route was at the beginning stage of operation, Coronet Ray would continue to monitor the changes in passenger volume. It would also maintain close liaison with TD and timely review its service level in order to provide suitable service for passengers.
- (b) If the service was to be extended to Passenger Terminal Building of the Airport, the journey time would be lengthened by 5 to 8 minutes. Apart from having impact on the operation of schedule, the frequency had to be adjusted as well. There were already bus routes travelling between Tung Chung North and Passenger Terminal Building of the Airport. If the service of GMB route no. 901 was extended to Passenger Terminal Building of the Airport, it would overlap with bus service. As such, detailed studies had to be conducted.

151. Miss Sherman CHOI said that extending GMB route no. 901 to Passenger Terminal Building of the Airport would lengthen its journey time and affect its existing frequency and passengers. At present, residents of Tung Chung North could travel directly to and from the Airport and Tung Chung North by Citybus route no. S56. As

such, the department and operator did not have plan to re-route GMB route no. 901. The department would closely monitor the service of the route and conduct review in timely manner to cope with passengers' needs.

152. Mr YIP Pui-kei said that GMB route no. 901 was the first GMB route in Tung Chung. Its target passengers were mainly residents of Tung Chung North. However, the present bus stops of route no. 901 could not tie in with residents' needs and thus the passenger volume was low. While residents of Tung Chung North could take route no. S56 to travel to and from the Airport, the route did not provide overnight services and thus could not cope with the needs of those working on shift in the Airport. He opined that extending the service of route no. 901 to Passenger Terminal Building of the Airport would not only provide convenient GMB service for Tung Chung North residents travelling to and from the Airport, but also increase the patronage of the route during late night hours.

153. Mr Holden CHOW said that rather than wasting the capacity of GMB route no. 901, extending the service to Passenger Terminal Building of the Airport to provide convenience for residents of Tung Chung North who worked at the Airport would be better. He hoped that the department and Coronet Ray would pro-actively study the proposal.

154. Mr YIP Pui-kei proposed that the service of GMB route no. 901 be extended to Passenger Terminal Building of the Airport and covered locations on Airport Island that route no. S56 did not route via so that the two were complementary to each other.

155. Miss Sherman CHOI said that the department noted Members' views. It would closely monitor the service of GMB route no. 901 and study feasible rationalisation measures with the operator to improve its operating condition.

156. Mr YIP Ho-yeung said that he would relay Members' views to the management, and would study improvement measures with the department.

157. Mr Eric KWOK said that when the route of GMB route no. 901 was under planning, Members had pointed out that the route did not meet the needs of the residents and proposed extension of the bus service to Yat Tung Estate and Mun Tung Estate in order to connect various areas of Tung Chung. However, the department did not adopt Members' views and therefore, the stops of route no. 901 did not meet residents' needs and the patronage was low. He proposed that the department should study the feasibility of extending route no. 901 to Tung Chung town centre and the Airport when conducting mid-term review.

158. Mr CHAN Kam-hung said that in the operation of GMB routes, priority should be given to the interests of residents rather than those of public transport operators. He opined that when applying for operation of new route, Coronet Ray had compromised so that its routes did not overlap with those of Kwoon Chung Bus. As such, he hoped that the department would, based on the premise of residents' interests, consider to re-route GMB route no. 901 again.

159. Miss Sherman CHOI said that the department noted Members' views. It would closely monitor the service of GMB route no. 901 and timely consult Members' views on feasible measure.

XIII. Any Other Business

(i) Incident of Discovery Bay bus driver being attacked

160. Ms Amy YUNG raised her views as follows:

- (a) On the night of 15 January this year, a bus driver was attacked by two Mainland passengers on a DB bus departing from Sunny Bay to DB North. In a video clip lasting about 2 minutes, a passenger was seen pulling the hair of the driver and slapping his head, as well as pulling at his clothes outside the bus and pushing his head against the bus body. The clip showed that other passengers were trying to mediate but failed, while the friend of the passenger concerned was attempting to block the cameras.
- (b) The Police did not take immediate action upon receipt of report. When the police officers arrived at the scene, the passenger concerned was gone. The case involved inflicting harm on other people at a public place but was classified as miscellaneous matter by the Police. While the Police was informed by hotel staff that the passenger concerned was a guest at the hotel, it did not go to the hotel at once to make arrest. She then requested the Police to follow up and take action but the passenger concerned had already checked out. She hoped that the Police would give an account of its follow-up action.
- (c) Over the past year, she had followed up repeatedly on the abuse of DB bus service by outsiders. Discovery Bay Services Management Limited responded that some people had to take DB buses to DB for work while tourists might travel by the vehicles provided by the hotel or by coaches. However, she found that a number of tourists other than people going to work took DB buses. The said incident was caused by tourists carrying a large amount of luggage aboard. She had once seen Mainland passengers standing beyond the yellow line while the bus was in motion and requested the driver to carry them to the hotel, which distracted the driver's attention. She opined that DB buses should serve only DB residents and the bus company should refuse to carry other people.
- (d) According to the newspaper reports, the bus company indicated that it adopted a "zero tolerance" attitude towards the above violence. She hoped that Mr Peter TSANG would respond on behalf of the company.

161. Mr YU Siu-bun said that the Police had instantly deployed officers to take follow-up action on the night of the incident after being informed by members of the public. At this stage, the case was classified as assault and Police investigation and

follow-up action were carried out. Since the investigation was underway, he could not disclose further details at this stage.

162. Mr Peter TSANG responded as follows:

- (a) The company adopted a “zero tolerance” attitude towards violence and condemned the violent acts against frontline staff. The bus driver was assaulted on the night of 15 January and the company reported the case to the Police in its name on the following day. It was understood that after the incident occurred, security staff had taken immediate action to separate the assailant and the driver. The company, upon receipt of the report, had subsequently deployed personnel to render assistance to the driver, and would provide him with all necessary assistance and support him in lodging a complaint to the Police against the violent acts.
- (b) Regarding the views about outsiders travelling on DB buses, he had repeatedly pointed out that many outsiders including people working at DB, students and school staff relied on DB ferry and bus services for travelling to and from DB, provision of transport services for them was necessary. Moreover, apart from the facilities provided for DB residents’ use, there were public recreational facilities in the area which were open to all Hong Kong people. If people were not allowed to use the transport service of DB, they could hardly use the public facilities concerned.

163. Ms Amy YUNG raised her views as follows:

- (a) She had written to TD several times demanding investigation into breaches of Residents’ Service (RS) licensing conditions but had not yet received any concrete reply after several months. Now that a serious incident happened, she hoped that the department would explain how the matter would be handled or whether any of the RS licensing conditions specified the ways of handling such matters.
- (b) Mr Peter TSANG indicated just now that DB buses should also serve outsiders who travelled to and from DB. However, many tourists carried a large amount of luggage aboard and did not place them properly, causing obstruction and even a flare-up. Some tourists even stood beyond the yellow line or spoke to the driver when the bus was in motion, which would distract driving and could be very dangerous. She urged the department to enforce the RS licensing requirements.

164. Mr Eric KWOK said that the hotel at DB was owned by Hong Kong Resort Company Limited which should provide luggage racks on DB buses if they were used for carrying tourists to and from the hotel. He did not want to see disputes arise among DB residents and tourists over the stowing of luggage, leading to conflicts between Hong Kong people and Mainland tourists.

165. Ms Amy YUNG said that luggage racks were installed on DB buses, but they could only accommodate hand-carried baggage of local residents and there was not enough room for too many bulky luggage. As there was a bus stop next to the hotel, she proposed that the hotel arranged coaches to transfer hotel guests between the hotel and Sunny Bay Station, instead of misusing the RS. She requested the department to look into the enquiry on cases involving breaches of RS licensing conditions and reply within a week. Moreover, she found that a number of vehicles in DB were used in violation of their licence registrations and asked the department to take enforcement action as appropriate.

166. Miss Sherman CHOI said that the department was following up on Ms YUNG's enquiry and would give a reply soonest within a week. The department was very concerned about the assault on bus driver and would remind the operator to formulate practical improvement measures, which included providing training to bus drivers on how to communicate with passengers and deal with incidents as well as strengthening onboard publicity to educate passengers.

167. Mr Peter TSANG said that DB buses had been equipped with relatively large luggage racks for passengers to place luggage. In fact, for many years of operation, DB bus service had never encountered such serious violence and the said case was just an isolated incident. In any event, the company would not tolerate violent acts. It would co-operate with the Police and assist in investigation if necessary and provide all necessary support to the assaulted driver.

168. Ms Amy YUNG raised her views as follows:

- (a) Given the cultural difference between the Mainland and Hong Kong, the issue might not be solved effectively even if the bus company stepped up education through onboard broadcast. Owing to the severity of misuse of RS at present, she opined that hotel guests should be conveyed by buses provided by the hotel but not RS.
- (b) She received complaints from a number of bus drivers about being treated impolitely but they were reluctant to report the matters to the company. The assaulted driver in the said incident was also reluctant to report to the Police in the hope of settling the incident peacefully. She hoped that the bus company could provide practical support to staff when need arose.

169. Mr Peter TSANG said that immediately after the incident, the company issued notice to remind bus drivers to avoid quarreling with passengers and, without compromising personal and passenger safety, to report to the Police and the company in case of incidents. The company was exploring feasible measures including installation of closed-circuit televisions onboard to warn those with harmful intent so as to prevent similar incidents from happening. Where necessary, the company would certainly make its utmost effort to assist in Police investigation.

170. Ms Amy YUNG suggested the bus company display notices at prominent

places such as bus bodies or licence plates specifying that the buses were for exclusive use of residents to avoid tourists mistaking them for franchised buses. She also hoped that TD would post guidelines at appropriate locations of the buses stating that RS was only for use by residents.

(ii) Highways Department's Minor Traffic Improvement Projects and Works Schedules

171. The Chairman welcomed Ms POON Nga-man, Amy, District Engineer/General (2)A of HyD to the meeting to respond to enquiries. HyD had submitted, prior to the meeting, the Islands District Minor Traffic Improvement Projects and Works Schedules (the Schedules) as at early January of the current year. The Schedules were tabled at the meeting and Members were invited to raise enquiries and opinions.

172. Members noted the relevant report.

XIV. Date of next meeting

173. The meeting was adjourned at 5:47 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 2:00 p.m. on 18 March 2019 (Monday).

-END-