

(Translation)

Minutes of Meeting of Traffic and Transport Committee

Date : 18 March 2019 (Monday)

Time : 2:00 p.m.

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

Members

Mr CHEUNG Fu (Vice-Chairman)
Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS
Mr YU Hon-kwan, Randy, JP
Mr CHAN Lin-wai
Mr FAN Chi-ping
Mr LOU Cheuk-wing
Ms YU Lai-fan
Ms LEE Kwai-chun
Mr TANG Ka-piu, Bill, JP
Ms YUNG Wing-sheung, Amy
Mr KWONG Koon-wan
Mr CHOW Ho-ding, Holden
Ms TSANG Sau-ho, Josephine
Mr KWOK Ping, Eric
Ms FU Hiu-lam, Sammi
Mr HO Siu-kei
Mr WONG Fuk-kan
Mr WAN Tung-yat
Mr YUEN King-hang
Mr YIP Pui-kei
Mr LAU Chin-pang
Mr LEE Ka-ho

Attendance by Invitation

Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian	Senior Transport Officer/Public Pier, Transport Department
Mr LAW Ho-kin, John	Engineer 3/Walkability, Transport Department
Miss HO Kit-ying, Florence	Senior Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry 2, Transport Department
Miss LEUNG Ka-man, Eunice	Transport Officer/Bus/Lantau, Transport Department
Miss YU Wing-sze, Natalie	Senior Transport Officer/Bus/Lantau, Transport Department
Ms CHOI Yuen-tsang	Engineer/CWY1-2, Highways Department
Ms AU YEUNG Wai-sum	Senior Engineer/CWY 1, Highways Department
Mr CHEN Hao-ting, Ambrose	Environmental Protection Officer(Mobile Source)31, Environmental Protection Department

Mr KWOK Chi-hang	Administrative Assistant/Lands (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Mr SZETO Hor-keung	Senior Land Executive/Land Control (District Lands Office, Islands), Lands Department
Mr YUNG Chung-bun, Thomas	Deputy Project Team Leader, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Miss LI Hok-yee	Engineer / Projects 3 C, Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr Jeremy KWAN	Engineer, Mott MacDonald
Mr CHEUNG Kiu-kwong, Andy	Manager, Operations, Long Win Bus Company Limited
Mr Rayson LAW	Planning and Support Officer I, Long Win Bus Company Limited
Mr LEE Kwok-cheung	Director, Ho Tin & Associates Consulting Engineers Limited
Mr Mistral SIN	Manager (Planning), Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited
Mr Brian NG	Chief Planning Officer, Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited
Mr Albert LEUNG	Manager (Operation Department II – Traffic), Citybus Limited/New World First Bus Services Limited

In Attendance

Mr AU Sheung-man, Benjamin	Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
Miss WONG Fong-yu, Kammy	Executive Officer (District Council)3, Islands District Office
Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung	District Operations Officer (Lantau), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr LAM Yiu-tong	OC Operations Sub-Unit (Cheung Chau Division), Hong Kong Police Force
Miss CHOI Siu-man, Sherman	Senior Transport Officer/Islands 1, Transport Department
Miss SIN Kai-wai Marie	Senior Transport Officer/Islands 2, Transport Department
Ms YUEN Kit-fung	Engineer/Islands 2, Transport Department
Mr WAN Chi-kin	District Engineer/Islands, Highways Department
Mr AU Hok-lang	Engineer/22 (Lantau), Civil Engineering and Development Department
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
Ms Sonja CHAN	Assistant 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
---------------------------	---

II. Reconstruction of Pak Kok Pier on Lamma Island-Report on the revised pier design layout
(Paper T&TC 12/2019)

6. The Acting Chairman welcomed Mr YUNG Chung-bun, Thomas, Deputy Project Team Leader and Miss LI Hok-ye, Engineer/Projects 3 C of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD); Mr CHEUNG Chi-yeung, Fabian, Senior Transport Officer/Public Pier of the Transport Department (TD); as well as Mr Jeremy KWAN, Engineer of Mott MacDonald to the meeting to present the paper.

7. Mr Thomas YUNG briefed on the background of the project and added that the department had consulted the ferry service operators on the revised layout, and the ferry service operators welcomed the proposal.

8. Mr Jeremy KWAN presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint presentation.

9. Mr Thomas YUNG welcomed Members to give comments on the latest design of the pier, and said that the department would consider the comments, if any, and fine tune the design. Upon successful application for funding, the proposed works were expected to commence by late 2019 and would take about two years.

10. Ms YU Lai-fan enquired whether the department would only provide a ramp along the public landing steps to the west of the pier instead of on both the eastern and western sides of the pier. She hoped that ramps could be provided on both sides because the pier would be easily affected by monsoon and wave due to its geographical location.

11. Mr Thomas YUNG remarked that the width of the pier would be increased substantially if ramps were provided along the landing steps on both sides of the pier. As such, a ramp would be provided on one side only. According to the research findings of the consultant, Hong Kong was mainly affected by the north-easterly monsoon in winter, resulting in bigger and more frequent waves to the east of the pier. If the ramp was located beside the western landing steps, residents in need might make use of it for most of the time.

12. Mr CHOW Yuk-tong recommended that the ferry pier shelter be constructed with non-reflective materials to avoid light pollution caused by sunlight reflected by the shelter.

13. Mr Thomas YUNG indicated that attention would be given to the materials to be used for making the shelter.

14. Ms Amy YUNG recommended installation of solar panels at the ferry pier shelter to generate renewable energy without causing light pollution.

15. Mr Thomas YUNG indicated that installation of solar panels on ferry pier shelter was already included in the project by the department during the design stage.

(Mr YUEN King-hang, Mr WAN Tung-yat and Mr LAU Chin-pan joined the meeting at around 2:05 p.m., 2:10 p.m. and 2:15 p.m. respectively.)

III. Bus Route Planning Programme 2019-2020 for Islands District
(Paper T&TC 13/2019)

16. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss YU Wing-sze, Natalie, Senior Transport Officer/Bus/Lantau and Miss LEUNG Ka-man, Eunice, Transport Officer/Bus/Lantau of TD; Mr Mistral SIN, Manager (Planning) and Mr Brian NG, Chief Planning Officer of Citybus Limited (Citybus)/New World First Bus Services Limited (NWFB); Mr Albert LEUNG, Manager (Operation Department II-Traffic) of Citybus; as well as Mr CHEUNG Kiu-kwong, Andy, Manager, Operations and Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win Bus Company Limited (Long Win) to the meeting to present the paper.

17. Miss Natalie YU briefly presented the paper.

18. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) To tie in with the visiting hours of the North Lantau Hospital (NLTH), he was opposed to advancing the departure time of the last trip of NLB route no. 37H NLTH bound from 11:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., and advancing the departure time of the last trip of route no. 37H Ying Tung Estate bound from 12:00 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. Despite the round-the-clock service provided by the accident and emergency department of NLTH, the bus company proposed the above arrangement. He guessed it was for the purpose of saving resources as the patronage of route no. 37H at night was low, with the co-operation of TD in the arrangement. He expressed dissatisfaction to this. Besides, occupation of Yu Tai Court in Tung Chung Area 27 would take place by the end of next year, coupled with the gradual enhancement of the existing services and introduction of specialist services in NLTH, the demand for route no. 37H would be ever increasing. He therefore recommended enhancing the service of NLB route no. 37H.
- (b) According to his understanding, the bus fare of Long Win route no. S64 was \$3.6, but that of route no. S65 was \$4.7. He considered the fare unreasonable and requested Long Win to adjust downward the fare of route no. S65 to \$3.6. In the past six months, a number of working commuters reflected to him the inadequacy of bus service. Therefore, he suggested that route no. S64 should route through the Office Building of the Civil Aviation Department (CAD) to facilitate people working there. Moreover, as some residents in Yat Tung Estate and Mun Tung Estate had to perform shift duty and go to work during public holidays, he proposed that route no. S64 should route through AsiaWorld-Expo (AWE) for residents to go to work there.
- (c) According to the “Bus Route Planning Programme 2019-2020 of Islands District” (BRPP), the proposed bus allocation for Citybus route nos. E11S, E21A and E22S was pending implementation. He enquired why the proposal had not yet been implemented.

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

- (a) Some residents in Tung Chung North reflected that the frequencies of Long Win “E” route buses were inadequate. They often had to wait for 15 to 20 minutes for “E” route buses travelling to Tsing Ma Bridge, and then wait for another 15 to 20 minutes at Tsing Ma Bridge to interchange for “E” route feeder buses, adding up to a total waiting time of more than 30 minutes. He asked why TD re-allocated buses operating route no. E42 to “A” routes, and proposed that Long Win should enhance “E” route bus service.
- (b) According to the BRPP, the proposed bus allocation for route nos. E11S, E21A and E22S aimed to tie in with the population growth in Area 27, but the measures were pending implementation. Since Area 27 was anticipated to be completed and start resident intake in late this year or next year, he asked whether TD would implement the proposed measures only after completion and resident intake of the area, and hoped that TD would provide a timetable of implementing the measures.

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

- (a) He welcomed the introduction of route no. S65 to provide service to residents in Tung Chung West and people working in the airport. Although the routings of route nos. S65 and S64X were similar, the bus fare of the former was higher than that of the latter. He enquired of Long Win why the fares of the two routes were different.
- (b) He believed that the objective of the proposed introduction of route no. S65 was to replace the proposal of splitting the whole-day service of route no. S64 into route nos. S64X and S64C. However, as the frequency of route no. S65 was every 20 to 30 minutes per headway in morning peak hours, the service level could hardly meet the demand of Mun Tung Estate residents who needed to commute to the airport or worked in the airport. Unless TD and Long Win increased the service frequency according to the demand after the introduction of route no. S65, otherwise, in addition to the introduction of route no. S65, it was necessary to split the whole-day service of route no. S64 into route nos. S64X and S64C or provide route no. S64X bus service in afternoon peak hours.

21. Ms Sammi FU expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She had reflected that many residents in Tung Chung North (including local residents and ethnic minorities) were working in Tsim Sha Tsui. However, only three trips of Citybus route no. E21X departed for Tsim Sha Tsui in the morning, which could not meet the need of residents. For this reason, she welcomed the introduction of Citybus route no. N21A plying between Tung Chung North and Tsim Sha Tsui in the small hours. She remarked that apart from the morning peak hours, there was also a certain demand for bus service plying between Tung Chung North and Tsim Sha Tsui in the afternoon peak

hours. As such, she hoped TD and Citybus would consider introducing bus service plying from Tsim Sha Tsui to Tung Chung North in the future.

- (b) While frequency enhancement would be made to Citybus route no. S52 plying between Yat Tung Estate and the aircraft maintenance area, there was only one departure per day for Citybus route no. S52A plying between Tung Chung North and the aircraft maintenance area. Since many residents in Tung Chung North were working in the aircraft maintenance area, she enquired whether TD would consider improving the frequency of route no. S52A.
- (c) According to the BRPP, Citybus would allocate one more bus to operate route no. S1. Given the long journey time of route no. S56 at present and the service provision of route no. S1 routing via Tung Chung town centre already in existence, she proposed that route no. S56 no longer routed via Tung Chung town centre to shorten the journey time, facilitating a faster journey for passengers travelling from the airport to Tung Chung North.

22. Mr YIP Pui-kei expressed his views as follows:

- (a) As proposed in the BRPP, the NLTH bound trips of NLB route no. 37H during 9:00 p.m. to 11:30 p.m. would be cancelled. In fact, some healthcare practitioners and patients might need to go to the hospital during 9:00 p.m. to 11:30 p.m., and reduction of route no. 37H trips might affect the healthcare practitioners going to work or the patients seeking medical consultation. Therefore, he objected to the proposed arrangement. He understood that the first departure of route no. 37H was scheduled for 6:30 a.m., but some staff of the hospital needed to start work at 7:00 a.m. Even if staff of the hospital residing in Ying Tung Estate or Tung Chung North took the first departure of the route, they could not arrive at the hospital on time. Such being the case, he proposed to advance the time of the first departure to 6:20 a.m.
- (b) He opined that there was much room for improvement for the feeder bus service plying between Tung Chung North and Tung Chung town centre. Although NLB had arranged double-decker buses to operate route no. 37M, the route was operated at 10-minute intervals during the peak hours from 8:30 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. As many passengers boarded on the bus at the bus stop at Ying Tung Estate, passengers waiting at the next stop could hardly get on the bus and needed to wait for 10 to 20 minutes for taking the coming departure. He therefore proposed to enhance the frequency to every six to eight minutes per headway during morning peak hours.
- (c) Given the large number of waiting passengers in peak hours, if NLB arranged four-wheeled buses with a passenger capacity of about 90 persons to operate route no. 37M, some passengers would fail to board the bus because the bus was full, and had to spend time to wait for the next trip. Therefore, he suggested that NLB should allocate six-wheeled buses with a passenger capacity of about 130 persons to run route no. 37M to shorten the waiting time of passengers, and that luggage rack should be installed inside the bus for use by passengers.

- (d) While the first departure of Citybus route no. S56 departed at 5:50 a.m., many airport staff reflected that they might not be able to arrive at the airport on time for work even taking the first departure. He therefore proposed to advance the time of the first departure to 5:40 a.m. to meet the needs of residents.
- (e) Members had proposed to implement whole-day service for all “A” route airport buses last year. Since many residents in Tung Chung North had to travel to Hong Kong Island for work, he enquired if Citybus could convert route no. E11A to whole-day service.
- (f) There was currently no overnight bus route serving Tung Chung North. The overnight Citybus route no. N11 did not route through Tung Chung North after arriving at Tung Chung town centre. He enquired whether Citybus could arrange for route nos. N11 and E11 to route via Tung Chung North to provide overnight feeder bus service to residents in Tung Chung North.
- (g) He hoped that Long Win would report the progress of the proposed improvements for route nos. N31 and E43.
- (h) Long Win route no. E42P travelled via areas such as Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi, providing fast bus service to residents plying between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi. However, there were only two departures of route no. E42P during 6:45 a.m. to 7:45 a.m., and the departure times could not tie in with the travelling time of students going to school. He enquired whether Long Win would consider increasing the frequency of route no. E42P.

23. Mr WONG Wah said that the departure time of the last trip of NLB route no. 37H bounding for NLTH and that bounding for Ying Tung Estate in Tung Chung North would be advanced by two and a half hours. The adjustment would affect about 20 passengers in total, i.e. an average of one to two passengers per frequency. Affected passengers might take NLB route no. 37 at the nearby bus stop. For optimal use of resources, frequency improvement of bus service should not be the only consideration. In case the patronage of a bus route was low and the number of passengers affected by frequency adjustment was small, the bus company might make adjustment to service frequency according to the patronage and actual situation. He hoped Members would appreciate that.

24. Miss Natalie YU made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding the fare level of route no. S65, the scale of fares of franchised bus companies was determined by the Chief Executive in Council. The franchised bus companies would determine the actual fares of individual bus routes having regard to the operating condition and other related factors, but the fares could not exceed those specified in the scale of fares. The currently proposed fare of route no. S65 was compliant with the scale of fares.
- (b) Regarding the proposal of arranging for route no. S65 to route through the AWE and Office Building of CAD, route no. S65 was designed to take a more direct

routing, i.e. operating to and from the airport via Cathay Pacific City only. If route no. S65 had to route via the AWE and CAD Headquarter, it was anticipated that the journey time would be prolonged and the proposed headways might be affected, thus careful consideration should be given.

- (c) TD was aware that residents were moving in Mun Tung Estate in a progressive manner. If the proposal regarding route no. S65 was implemented, TD and Long Win would closely monitor the passenger demand and, where necessary, conduct a timely review on the service arrangement.
- (d) TD noted that the visiting hours of NLTH ended at 8:00 p.m. at present. It therefore proposed to advance the departure times of the last trips of both bounds of route no. 37H to 9:00 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. respectively. Based on TD's surveys conducted earlier on the patronage of the substitutes of route no. 37H, namely, route nos. 37 and 38, it was estimated that route nos. 37 and 38 would have sufficient carrying capacity to meet the demand of the existing passengers of route no. 37H.
- (e) After implementing the proposed measures for Long Win route no. A42, TD would closely monitor the patronage of route no. E42 and adjust the frequency as appropriate according to the guidelines and passenger demand.
- (f) Regarding the proposal of enhancing the bus service for Tung Chung North, TD would continue to closely monitor the passenger demand and discuss with the bus companies concerned as appropriate.

25. Mr Mistral SIN made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding Members' concern over the proposed bus allocation for Citybus route nos. E11S, E21A and E22S which had not been implemented, Citybus had to take into account the relevant guidelines and actual passenger conditions before considering whether to increase the frequency of the routes. As the proposals had not been implemented when the consultation paper of the BRPP were under preparation, they were marked "pending implementation" in the BRPP. As a matter of fact, Citybus had increased the frequency of route no. E11S since 28 February this year, providing a total of five departures in the morning. The patronage of route no. E22S did not meet the requirement for increasing frequency, and therefore the two trips were maintained in the morning. Citybus would continue to monitor the passenger demand and implement the plan of frequency improvement as appropriate.
- (b) Citybus noted Members' proposal of enhancing the bus service for Tung Chung North. Route nos. E11S, E11A and E23A were introduced in the past few years to enhance the bus service of Tung Chung North. Route no. N21A routing via Tung Chung North was also introduced this year. Citybus would continue to closely monitor the passenger demand in Tung Chung North and enhance bus service of the area as appropriate. Citybus noted the views concerning route nos. S52A and S56 and would undertake further study and consideration.

26. Mr Andy CHEUNG said that the frequencies of Long Win route nos. E32A and E31 had been changed to every 15 minutes per headway with effect from 2 February this year. According to observations, these routes which operated at a frequency of every 15 to 20 minutes per headway in peak hours could generally meet the passenger demand for the time being. Seeing that some residents (such as students) had certain demand for morning bus service, Long Win would explore the feasibility of increasing route frequencies in peak hours.

(Post-meeting note: The frequencies of route nos. E32A and E31 departing from Tung Chung in the morning from Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays) had been enhanced since 26 April 2019. The frequency of route no. E32A was enhanced to every 12 to 15 minutes per headway, while the service period of route no. E31 operating at a headway of 15 minutes was also extended.)

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

- (a) Long Win noted the views on the fare level of route no. S65 and remarked that extending the routing of route no. S65 might affect the proposed frequency arrangement. Long Win noted the proposal and would conduct study as appropriate.
- (b) Regarding the proposed increase of the service frequency of route no. S65, the proposed frequency stated in the BRPP was applicable to route no. S65 during its initial operation. Long Win would review the frequency arrangement of route no. S65 in a timely manner in the light of the passenger demand in Mun Tung Estate and Yat Tung Estate.
- (c) Regarding the proposed increase of the service frequency of route no. E42, Long Win expected that the new airport bus route no. A42 plying between Sha Tin and the airport would help release some passenger load of route no. E42. Long Win would conduct timely review of the service of route no. E42 having regard to the patronage and TD's guidelines on increasing or decreasing the number of vehicles to operate bus routes.
- (d) Regarding the proposal of providing route no. S64X bus service in afternoon peak hour, Long Win conducted study and considered that the proposal would affect passenger boarding in the vicinity of Hong Kong Air Cargo Terminals Limited and Air Mail Centre in afternoon peak hours, leaving only route no. S64C for them to choose. Long Win therefore had reservations on the proposal.
- (e) Regarding the proposed improvements to Long Win route nos. N31 and E43, Long Win would give response during the discussion on the relevant agenda item in due course.
- (f) Regarding the proposed increase of the service frequency of route no. E42P, since the service arrangement of E42P had been implemented for about one

month, Long Win would continue to monitor the passenger demand and review the frequency arrangement of route no. E42P according to TD's guidelines and the patronage.

(Post-meeting note: The frequency of route no. E42P had been increased since 26 April 2019. The service plying from Tung Chung to Sha Tin via Tsing Yi would be increased to four trips from Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays) and three trips on Saturday (excluding public holidays).)

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

- (a) Regarding the fare level of route no. S65, he said the representative of TD stated that the proposed fare level was compliant with the scale of fares but did not explain about the difference in bus fares between route nos. S64X and S65 with similar routings. Members of the public were discontented with the existing service arrangement of route no. S64 and had put forward proposed improvements. However, TD and the bus company simply responded by introducing a new bus route charging a higher fare. He thought that such arrangement did not meet people's expectations.
- (b) He said that the bus companies often failed to implement the proposals raised by Members at meetings or took follow-up action only after long delay. For example, the North District route had been put under discussion for years but had not yet been implemented. Moreover, the representative of Citybus said that the frequency arrangement of route nos. E11S and E22S would be adjusted as appropriate having regard to patronage. As he thought, the bus company was only concerned about its own interest, and always implemented frequency improvement to bus routes only after ensuring that it would make profit by doing so. Members' proposals and residents' transport needs were completely ignored.

29. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The routing of route no. S65 was similar to that of route no. S64X, but the fare of the former was higher. The representative of TD only pointed out that the proposed fare of route no. S65 was compliant with the scale of fares without explaining the difference in the fare levels. He held that TD's response failed to assuage residents' doubts, but would increase residents' discontent with the Government instead.
- (b) According to Annex 2, the round trips of route no. S65 departing from Mun Tung Estate at or before 9:00 a.m. from Monday to Saturday (except public holidays) and at or before 8:00 a.m. on Sunday and public holidays would not route via Chung Yan Road. He enquired why such arrangement was made. Seeing that route no. N21A was proposed to route via Tung Chung North in the BRPP, he thought that route no. S65 should also route via Yat Tung Estate.

30. Miss Natalie YU made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Regarding the views on the fare level of Long Win route no. S65, the bus company would need to deploy additional resources to operate a new route. The bus company may take the above factor into the consideration when determining the bus fare of a new route, which in turn, it might be reflected in the bus fare. Having said that, the Government had all along encouraged public transport service operators to lower the fares as far as possible, taking into account the operators' respective operating and financial conditions, so as to help reducing passengers' travelling expenses.
- (b) Even if route no. S65 did not operate via Chung Yan Road in morning peak hours, passengers in Yat Tung Estate could still travel to the airport by taking route no. S64X.

31. Mr Rayson LAW said that Long Win had nothing to add regarding TD's response to the views on the fare level of Long Win route no. S65. Regarding the views on route no. S65 not routing via Chung Yan Road, apart from the reason just given by TD, such arrangement was made in response to the earlier request made by Members to Long Win for providing faster bus service plying between Tung Chung West and the airport.

32. Mr Mistral SIN said that Citybus noted Members' views on route no. N21A routing via Mun Tung Estate and would examine the arrangement with TD. He suggested that residents in Mun Tung Estate should take route no. N21A at the bus stop on Chung Yan Road near NLTH.

(Mr Holden CHOW joined the meeting at around 3:00 p.m.)

IV. Provision of Cover to Walkway at Chui Kwan Drive near North Lantau Hospital to the Bus Stop outside Fire Station, Tung Chung
(Paper T&TC 14/2019)

33. The Acting Chairman welcomed Mr LAW Ho-kin, John, Engineer 3/Walkability of TD; Ms AU YEUNG Wai-sum, Senior Engineer/CWY 1 and Ms CHOI Yuen-tsang, Engineer/CWY1-2 of HyD; as well as Mr LEE Kwok-cheung, Director of Ho Tin & Associates Consulting Engineers Limited to the meeting to present the paper. The written reply of NLTH was tabled at the meeting for Members' perusal.

34. Ms CHOI Yuen-tsang briefly presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint presentation. She added that the scope of the proposed provision of cover to walkway covered a road section managed by TD and maintained by HyD which was about 370 metres long, and a road section under the purview of the Hospital Authority (HA) which was about 235 metres long. HyD had confirmed that the proposal (including the sections in red shown in Enclosure 1 to the paper) was technically feasible. It was preliminarily proposed that walkway cover be provided for the Chui Kwan Drive section (the existing walkway was about 1.5 metres wide) and the section from Tung Chung Fire Station to the bus stop (the existing walkway was about

3.5 metres wide), whereas walkway cover could not be provided for the road section of about 10 metres long off the substation of the fire station.

35. Mr LEE Kwok-cheung said that the proposed covered walkways would be installed with lighting facilities. Opaque plates in silver-grey colour were tentatively planned to be adopted for the cover, and the design was similar to that provided to ordinary walkways. The cover would be designed to be as wide as possible to enhance its functions. According to the relevant rules of CLP Power Hong Kong Limited (CLP), the access and ventilation points of a substation should be unobstructed. Therefore, the road section off the substation could not be provided with cover.

36. Ms CHOI Yuen-tsang said that after soliciting the views of Members, HyD would work on the detailed design of the project, conduct public consultation and proceed to other relevant works according to established procedures.

37. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The provision of cover to walkway project involved the footpath section located within the NLTH area which was managed by HA. At the previous meeting of Traffic and Transport Committee (T&TC), he had enquired of TD whether the design and works schedule of the road section concerned could tie in with the works undertaken by TD and HyD, and requested TD to report the latest status.
- (b) As stormy weather was frequent in Tung Chung, he suggested that the department should consider installing vertical rain baffles at the top edges of the cover to enhance its function as a rain shelter.
- (c) Since cover could not be provided to the road section of about 10 metres long off the substation, he recommended the departments concerned to write to CLP, requesting it to mount a canopy in front of the substation for sheltering pedestrians from rain.
- (d) According to the earlier response from the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), the covered walkway to be constructed on the section of Chung Yan Road near Chui Kwan Drive and Yu Tung Road fell within the scope of Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE). He enquired CEDD when the department would submit the relevant design to TD and whether the design could tie in with that of the other road sections.

38. Mr Holden CHOW requested TD, HyD and NLTH to provide the respective detailed works programme of the road sections undertaken, and suggested that the departments concerned should explore various feasible measures for providing cover at the road section off the substation.

39. Ms AU YEUNG Wai-sum made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The feasibility study on the project had been completed, and the next stages would include preparation of a detailed design, application for funding and

tendering exercise. Regarding works schedules, after soliciting the views of the Islands District Council (IDC), HyD would take follow-up action according to established procedures. A concrete timetable was not available for the time being, but HyD would strive for commencing the works as soon as possible.

- (b) Regarding the proposed installation of straight rain baffles at the top edges of the cover, HyD would explore the feasibility of the proposal during the detailed design stage.

40. Mr John LAW made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) As stated by the representative of NLTH under the management of HA at the IDC meeting on 25 February 2019, NLTH would undertake the cover construction for part of the walkway fell within the works scope of the hospital, and the feasibility study on the works had been completed. HA was reviewing and studying the report and noted that HyD had completed the feasibility study on provision of cover to walkways. HA would follow up with HyD and discuss the details of works, cover design, implementation details and budget of the project in due course with a view to confirming the specific implementation details and timetable. He indicated that NLTH would report to IDC the project details as appropriate.
- (b) He said that construction of the walkway cover on Chung Yan Road was undertaken by CEDD. Based on the joint reply of TD and CEDD, the provision of covered walkway on the section of Chung Yan Road between Chui Kwan Drive and Yu Tung Road would be implemented under the TCNTE project. CEDD had gazetted the roadworks of Ma Wan Chung Road including the above walkway in May 2018 and would, upon completion of the detailed design, submit funding application to the Legislative Council (LegCo) and commence the works as soon as possible.

41. Mr Holden CHOW agreed that vertical rain baffles should be installed at the top edges of the cover to enhance its function as a rain shelter, and opined that the department should explore various feasible measures for providing cover at the about-10-metre-long road section off the substation.

42. Mr Eric KWOK reiterated the proposal of mounting a canopy off the substation as a rain shelter. He understood that CLP was not a government department and might not take action according to Members' proposal, but Members should still make a request to CLP on behalf of the public. Regarding the walkway cover located within NLTH, he enquired CEDD when the design of walkway cover would be completed, and whether the design could tie in with the cover design for the road sections undertaken by TD and HyD.

43. Ms CHOI Yuen-tsang made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The department had liaised with CLP regarding provision of cover to the road section off the substation. As stipulated in CLP's guidelines, the access and

ventilation points of the substation should be unobstructed. Therefore, it was unsuitable to construct cover on the road section.

- (b) According to the relevant regulation, walkway cover could not be provided on pedestrian walkways off the emergency vehicle access of fire station.

44. Mr AU Hok-lang said that the line in black and white shown in Enclosure 1 to the paper indicated the section undertaken by HA. The construction of a covered walkway on the section of Chung Yan Road between Chui Kwan Drive and Yu Tung Road had been included in the TCNTE project which was undertaken by CEDD. CEDD had gazetted the roadworks of Ma Wan Chung Road including the above walkway in May 2018 and would, upon completion of the detailed design, submit funding application to LegCo and commence the works as soon as possible.

V. Question on Long Win Bus route No. E43
(Paper T&TC 15/2019)

45. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss Natalie YU, Senior Transport Officer/Bus/Lantau of TD; and Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of Long Win had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

46. Mr Holden CHOW briefly presented the question.

47. Miss Natalie YU said that TD proposed the introduction of Long Win route no. E43 plying between Fanling and Tung Chung Development Pier in the Bus Route Planning Programme 2017-2018. The bus route was proposed to operate from Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays) with two departures operating from Fanling at 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m., and two departures operating from Tung Chung Development Pier at 5:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. In response to the suggestions from the local community, it was suggested to detour the routing of route no. E43 to operate via Tung Chung town centre in early 2018, and relevant District Councils (DC) were consulted on the amended proposal. The local community generally welcomed the amended proposal during the consultation, but had comments to the implementation details. TD and the bus company would continue to maintain communication with Members of various DCs with a view to expeditiously implementing the proposal.

48. Mr Rayson LAW briefly presented the written reply.

49. Mr Holden CHOW agreed that route no. E43 routed via Tung Chung town centre and opined that the arrangement would meet the aspiration of residents. However, he considered the service inadequate because the trips in the morning only departed for Tung Chung and that in the evening only departed for North District. He recommended provision of trips plying between Tung Chung and North District in morning peak hours to meet the need.

50. Mr Rayson LAW said that Long Win noted the proposal of providing more trips to North District in morning peak hours. Since it involved allocation of resources in peak hours, Long Win would explore the feasibility in terms of resource utilisation.

51. Mr YIP Pui-kei said that new route nos. E31 and E32A were introduced in early February this year, but route no. E32A did not route through Tsing Yi, leading to the discontent of residents in Tung Chung North. As stated in the submitted BRPP, route no. E43 would bound for Tsing Yi via Tung Chung town centre and Tung Chung North. He hoped that route no. E43 would be converted to whole-day service soonest to provide Tung Chung residents with service plying between Tung Chung and Tsing Yi.

VI. Motion on request for increasing frequency of Long Win Bus route No. E32A and improving public transport service between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi
(Paper T&TC 17/2019)

52. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss CHOI Siu-man, Sherman, Senior Transport Officer/Islands 1 of TD; and Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of Long Win had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting. The motion was moved by Mr Holden CHOW and seconded by Ms LEE Kwai-chun.

53. Mr Holden CHOW briefly presented the motion.

54. Miss Sherman CHOI said that to tie in with the population growth in the new development area of Tung Chung North and Mun Tung Estate in Tung Chung West, TD and the bus company proposed converting route no. E32A to whole-day service in the 2017-2018 BRPP. Long Win route no. E31 would route via Mun Tung Estate in Tung Chung West but not Tung Chung North, and corresponding adjustment would be made to the service frequency, aiming to provide residents in Tung Chung North and Tung Chung West with more direct bus service between Tung Chung and Tsuen Wan. Long Win had implemented the proposal and increased the frequency of route no. E32A in morning peak hours to 15 minutes headway since 2 February this year. According to observation and operation record, the service of route no. E32A could generally meet the passenger demand. Regarding Members' proposal of enhancing the bus service plying between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi, TD was already aware of the service needs of residents prior to rationalisation of bus routes. However, most passengers taking route no. E31 travelled to Tsuen Wan and not many of them travelled to Tsing Yi. That said, Long Win arranged special trip of route no. E42 departing from Yat Tung Estate in morning peak hours to route via Tung Chung North since 18 February this year, and renumbered the route as E42P. Residents in Tung Chung North could take route no. E42P to travel directly to Tsing Yi in morning peak hours, whereas in other timeslots, they might take route no. E32A and interchange for route no. E31, E32 or E42 for plying between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi. TD and Long Win would continue to closely monitor the demand of residents in Tung Chung North for route no. E32A service and bus service bounding for Tsing Yi, and would make suitable arrangements when necessary.

55. Mr Rayson LAW briefly presented the written reply.

56. Mr Holden CHOW was discontented with the replies of Long Win and TD and indicated the actual situation was differed from what Long Win and TD had mentioned. According to his observations in the area, there was keen demand for bus service plying to and

from Tsing Yi, and thus residents complained about route no. E31 not routing via Tung Chung North. As such, he moved the motion on request for increasing the frequency of route no. E32A during peak hours and improving public transport service between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi, such as enhancing the bus service or providing minibus service travelling to Tsing Yi to meet the transport needs of residents in Tung Chung North. He opined that with a significant increase in population of Tung Chung, the problem had to be solved as soon as possible and hoped that the departments concerned would respond.

57. Mr YIP Pui-kei expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He had received more than 100 submissions from residents, reflecting that the new arrangement for route no. E32A had not been satisfactory since its implementation in early February this year. Firstly, route no. E32A was changed to whole-day service with a headway of 15 to 20 minutes. While Long Win replied that the passenger demand was met, he received many complaints from residents over the past month indicating that they waited at Tsing Ma Bridge for an hour and the bus still had not arrived, and this situation mainly occurred when people going off work. Moreover, the service frequency of route no. E32A was unstable. Although the bus information stated that the route operated at 15-minute intervals in morning peak hours, sometimes the bus might arrive in 10 minutes and then the next bus arrive after 25 minutes, causing confusion among passengers going to work or school.
- (b) Regarding the real-time bus arrival information provided via the mobile application (mobile app) of Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (KMB) at present, most residents reflected that the information provided via the mobile app was inaccurate. For example, while the mobile app showed that the next bus would arrive in four minutes, the waiting time shown became 24 minutes after a while, making residents unable to accurately anticipate the time for taking the bus. As for the bus service during the period when people going off work, taking the situation at Lantau Link Toll Plaza in early March this year as an example, residents waited from 5:30 p.m. until 6:30 p.m. when a bus arrived. Long Win replied that the one hour waiting time was due to the breakdown of bus. Residents were discontented with the instability of service frequency of route no. E32A since it was the only whole-day service routing via Tung Chung North, Lantau Link Toll Plaza and Ying Tung Estate. Even after the implementation of the new measures, residents still had to rely on this route.
- (c) Regarding bus routes plying to Tsing Yi, Long Win's written reply stated that the passengers interchanging for route no. E31 or E32 for Tsing Yi were fewer than those interchanging for Tsuen Wan. He said that although the proportion or number of residents travelling to Tsing Yi by bus was small, there was still a certain demand for bus service plying to Tsing Yi in morning peak hours, including residents travelling to Tsing Yi for school and work. Under the new arrangement, residents might not be able to accurately forecast the bus arrival time and thus late for school or work. He opined that Long Win and TD had to look squarely at the problem.

- (d) Route no. E42P departing from Yat Tung Estate to Sha Tin was re-routed to pass through Tung Chung North instead of Tung Chung town centre, and he welcomed the arrangement. As just stated, residents in Tung Chung had a certain demand for bus service plying to Tsing Yi in morning peak hours. He recommended TD to consider making appropriate adjustment to the frequency of route no. E42P, for example, advancing the departure at 6:45 a.m. to 6:20 a.m. so that residents could arrive at Tung Chung North at about 6:40 a.m. and would have plenty of time to interchange for other bus routes for Tsing Yi.

58. Mr LEE Ka-ho was also disappointed at TD's reply. The representative of TD had just pointed out that residents' demand for bus service plying to Tsing Yi was small in proportion. However, the actual causes of residents not using the bus service were lost trip problem, inadequate service frequency and long waiting time. After implementing the new service arrangement on 2 February this year, many residents had lodged complaints to him about the long waiting time at the public transport interchange (PTI) of Lantau Link Toll Plaza for route no. E32A for Tung Chung North during the peak hours when people going home from workplace. In addition, they always could not get on the bus because it was full. He suggested that TD should conduct site inspection at bus stops in Tung Chung during peak hours when people going off work or in morning peak hours to observe the passenger queues thereat. In the past, residents might take route no. E31, but after implementation of the new arrangement, route no. E32A became the only choice for passengers. He requested TD to increase the service frequency or provide additional bus routes plying to Tsing Yi, such as enhancing the service of route nos. E42 and E43 and re-routing route no. E32A to pass through Tsing Yi. He hoped TD and Long Win would implement the proposals.

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

- (a) Long Win noted Members' views on the waiting time of passengers for route no. E32A at Lantau Link Toll Plaza during peak hours. Members might provide the concrete dates or times regarding the situation to Long Win for follow-up.
- (b) There were several causes contributing to the problem of unpunctuality of bus service. For example, traffic conditions during the operation of bus or pick-up/drop-off activities at en-route stops might affect the journey time and thus the arrival time of route no. E32A buses at Lantau Link Toll Plaza. Long Win would continue to keep track of the situation and, where necessary, its field staff would make immediate adjustment to bus departures to meet passenger needs.
- (c) Regarding the bus service plying between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi, although the number of residents taking route no. E32A and interchanging for route nos. E31 and E32 was small, Long Win would continue to pay attention to the situation and needs of residents. Residents might travel from Tung Chung North to Tsing Yi by route no. E42P in the morning at present. Long Win would continue to monitor the service level of route no. E42P and explore the feasibility of increasing the service frequency in the morning.

- (d) Regarding the accuracy of the estimated bus arrival time provided via the mobile app, Long Win noted Members' views and would relay to the department concerned for follow-up.

60. Mr YIP Pui-kei expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He asked whether Long Win or TD had made any specific improvements to address the problems arising from the new service arrangement for route nos. E31 and E32A. He also asked Long Win why such situation was caused and whether it was due to inadequate manpower and vehicles or operational problem.
- (b) Long Win could not always use traffic condition as an excuse of unpunctual bus arrival time because traffic condition was an objective condition which would be indifferent to various bus routes. He asked whether Long Win would consider various methods such as recruitment of additional manpower to improve the quality of bus service.
- (c) Regarding the mobile app, he enquired whether the software was aided by a positioning system or a database to provide forecasted or real-time arrival time of bus. He opined that residents relied heavily on the forecasted bus arrival time provided by the software. If Long Win could improve the software and hence the accuracy of information, residents would be able to plan their trips with more accurate information.

61. Mr Rayson LAW responded as follows:

- (a) Long Win noted Members' comments on the mobile app and would relay to the department concerned for follow-up.
- (b) Regarding the proposed rationalisation of route nos. E31 and E32A, Long Win provided the service since 2 February this year in accordance with the proposal stated in the 2017-2018 BRPP. The frequency of route no. E32A in morning peak hours was increased from the originally proposed headway of 20 minutes to 15 minutes, and the service of the route was enhanced. Most passengers expressed satisfaction with the arrangement. For example, passengers taking route no. E31 could travel to Tsuen Wan without passing through Tung Chung North anymore, whereas passengers taking route no. E32A could directly travel from Tung Chung North to Tsuen Wan instead of taking route no. E31 which routed via Tsing Yi, and reducing the journey time by 10 minutes. Some passengers had reflected to Long Win that they welcomed the above rationalisation of bus routes.
- (c) Long Win would continue to recruit bus drivers and try its best to maintain the time of buses departing from bus terminals and arriving at en-route stops. Long Win would continue to take follow-up action and monitor the service level.

62. Mr Holden CHOW opined that Long Win still did not understand the actual situation of the area. The signatures of a few hundred residents in the area collected by him and Mr YIP Pui-kei were proof of the situation. Buses operating route no. E42 Sha Tin bound routed via Tsing Yi and many passengers were unable to get on the buses which were already full upon arrival in morning peak hours. He hoped that the bus company would follow up on this.

63. The Acting Chairman invited Members to vote on the motion by a show of hands. There were 21 voted for, no against and no abstaining. The motion was passed.

(Post-meeting note: The frequencies of route nos. E32A and E31 departing from Tung Chung in the morning of Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays) had been enhanced since 26 April 2019. The frequency of route no. E32A had been enhanced to every 12 to 15 minutes per headway, while the service period during which route no. E31 operated at a headway of 15 minutes was extended. On the same day, the frequency of route no. E42P was also increased to four trips from Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays) and three trips on Saturday (excluding public holidays), travelling from Tung Chung to Sha Tin via Tsing Yi.)

VII. Question on request for enhancement of Long Win route nos. E31 and E32A and provision of overnight bus services for Mun Tung Estate
(Paper T&TC 18/2019)

VIII. Question on Long Win route nos. E31 and E32A
(Paper T&TC 30/2019)

64. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss CHOI Siu-man, Sherman, Senior Transport Officer/Islands 1 of TD; and Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win to the meeting to respond to the questions. The written replies of Long Win had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

65. Mr Eric KWOK said that as his question (Item VII) was related to the question raised by Ms Sammi FU (Item VIII), he suggested the two items be discussed together. The Acting Chairman said that Members agreed to combine Items VII and VIII for discussion.

66. Mr Eric KWOK briefly presented the question set out in Paper T&TC 18/2019.

67. Ms Sammi FU briefly presented the question set out in Paper T&TC 30/2019.

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

- (a) Since the implementation of the new service arrangement for Long Win route nos. E31 and E32A on 2 February this year, TD had all along closely monitored the situation after bus service rationalisation. The service level of the two bus routes could generally meet the passenger demand at present. TD noted the concern of the local community over the service level of the routes, particularly the service level during peak hours. To closely monitor the service level of the routes concerned,

TD would review the operation records of the two routes and conduct site investigation. In case TD identified that the services could not meet passenger demand or erratic, it would follow up with Long Win as appropriate.

- (b) Regarding the service of route no. E41 Tai Po Tau bound in morning peak hours, Long Win had checked the operation recorded on 23 January this year and found that the trips operating from the AWE in morning peak hours had departed according to the scheduled times in general. However, the journey of some trips might have been affected by the pick-up/drop-off activities or traffic light signals, causing deviation in time for arriving at various en-route stops in Tung Chung. Long Win would review and explore the enhancement of frequency arrangement in morning peak hours to better meet passenger demand.
- (c) Regarding the views on the service of Long Win route no. N31, TD had sought views from relevant DCs on the proposal of route no. N31 routing via Mun Tung Estate and Ying Tung Estate, and would implement the proposal after examining the relevant views. Negotiation on the details between TD and Long Win was in progress, and the proposal would be implemented as soon as possible.

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

- (a) Regarding the comments on the service of route nos. E31 and E32A, in the light of observations and operation records, the service level of the two bus routes were found to be capable of meeting passenger demand in general at all timeslots for the time being. On residents' comment on the bus routes plying between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi as reflected by Members, Long Win would closely monitor the passenger demand and follow up with TD as appropriate for service improvement.
- (b) Regarding the frequency of route no. E41 Tai Po Tau bound in morning peak hours, Long Win had checked the vehicle operating information record on 23 January this year and found that the trips departing from the AWE in morning peak hours had departed according to the scheduled times in general. However, some trips were affected by pick-up/drop-off activities or traffic light signals during the bus journey, causing deviation in time for arriving at various en-route stops in Tung Chung. Long Win would review and explore the enhancement of frequency arrangement in morning peak hours to better meet passenger demand.
- (c) Regarding the views on the proposal of route no. N31 routing via Mun Tung Estate as mentioned by the representative of TD, the department had conducted local consultation on the proposal. Negotiation on the details between Long Win and TD was in progress, and the proposal would be implemented as soon as possible.

70. Mr Holden CHOW said that when he conducted site inspection regarding the lost trip situation of route no. E41, two route no. E41 buses were found to be arriving at the bus stop at 7:30 a.m. and 7:35 a.m. consecutively, but the next bus arrived at the stop only at 8:02 a.m. He had reflected this situation to Long Win, suggesting that a regular frequency at an interval of 15 minutes should be provided for optimal use of bus resources and effective diversion of passengers.

71. Mr Eric KWOK hoped that the amended proposal for route no. N31 could be implemented late this month as scheduled, and expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The new service arrangement of route nos. E31 and E32A was implemented on 2 February this year. Route no. E31 operated via Tsing Yi before splitting into two routes, but the new route no. E32A did not route via Tsing Yi, which caused inconvenience to residents who used to travel to Tsing Yi by route no. E31. Although the bus service of route no. E31 had become more convenient and faster, and attracted more passengers after making a detour to Mun Tung Estate, there were often insufficient trips for the route. He requested that the frequencies of route nos. E31 and E32A in morning peak hours be increased and route no. E32A routed via Tsing Yi.
- (b) According to information, the frequency of route no. E32 during peak hours between 8:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. had increased from every 20 to 25 minutes per headway to every 15 minutes per headway. However, the frequency of route no. E41 during peak hours still maintained at every 20 to 25 minutes per headway. According to Long Win's written reply, the service level of route no. E41 could meet passenger demand in general at all timeslots for the time being. Nevertheless, based on the observations during site inspections conducted at 7:30 a.m. on 1 March 2019, 7:20 a.m. on 6 March 2019, 7:32 a.m. on 11 March 2019, and 8:20 a.m. on 13 March 2019, buses departing from the airport were already full upon arrival at the Tung Chung Swimming Pool bus stop where there were many passengers waiting for buses. He would provide the relevant photos to Long Win for reference in due course, and recommended site inspection be conducted by Long Win or TD.
- (c) Some drivers of goods vehicles reflected that two route no. E32A buses were parked side by side at Tung Chung Development Pier at night obstructing the carriageway. Affected drivers were forced to drive in the opposite direction of the traffic. He proposed that Long Win should remind bus drivers to park the buses one after another to avoid causing road obstruction.

72. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that, as reflected by some residents late last year, the frequency of route no. E41 was reduced significantly from previously. He had relayed residents' opinion to TD which responded that Long Win had made service adjustment since 24 October 2018, reducing the frequency of route no. E41 during 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. from every 15 to 20 minutes per headway to every 20 to 25 minutes per headway. He held that residents had keen demand for the service of route no. E41, and queried the justifications for the above service adjustment. Moreover, the frequency of "E" route buses (including route no. E41) was very irregular. For example, the bus route might operate at an interval of about 20 to 25 minutes

and sometimes at an interval of more than 30 minutes. He suggested that TD and Long Win should follow up on the problem.

73. Ms Sammi FU said that many residents in Tung Chung North were previously living in Tsing Yi and would travel to Tsing Yi for visiting relatives and friends from time to time. Some residents even needed to go to work or school in Tsing Yi every day. In the past, they might take route no. E31 for travelling between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi. However, since the implementation of the new service arrangement for route nos. E31 and E32A, the new route no. E32A did not operate via Tsing Yi and so residents had to interchange for route no. E31 or E32 at Lantau Link Toll Plaza, which was very inconvenient due to the long wait. She hoped that TD would expeditiously review the service performance of route nos. E31 and E32A upon rationalisation of bus service, and explore providing more bus routes plying between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi.

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

- (a) In mid-February this year, Mr Holden CHOW reflected to Long Win the irregular frequency of route no. E41 departing from Tung Chung Cable Car Terminal. Long Win replied Mr Holden CHOW in writing in late February. As explained, among the two buses operating route no. E41 which arrived at the Cable Car Terminal at about 7:30 a.m., one of them was running a regular trip departing from the AWE and the other was running a special trip departing from the Cable Car Terminal. The temporary deployment of buses had caused buses of two different frequencies arriving at the Cable Car Terminal within a short time, but the service provided by the regular trips was not adversely affected. Long Win would review the effectiveness of the frequency arrangement and explore to improve such arrangement for effective utilisation of resources.
- (b) On implementation arrangement for the amended proposal of route no. N31, as mentioned a moment ago, Long Win and TD were discussing the details at this stage, aiming to implement the proposal by the end of March this year. Long Win would announce the details after approval was granted.
- (c) Regarding the concern over patronage increase of route no. E31 upon implementation of the new service arrangement for Long Win route nos. E31 and E32A, Long Win would continue to keep in view the patronage of route nos. E31 and E32A and review the arrangement for improvement of frequency as appropriate.
- (d) Regarding the request for introducing more bus routes departing from Tung Chung North for Tsing Yi, observations revealed that passengers who needed to interchange for buses plying between Tung Chung North and Tsing Yi only represented a small portion. Long Win noted Members' opinion from their observations in the district, and would study how to further improve bus service.
- (e) Regarding route no. E32A buses parked side by side in Tung Chung Development Pier, Long Win would follow up and make improvement to the parking space with a view to reducing the impact on other vehicles.

(Post-meeting note: Route no. N31 was re-routed to operate via Ying Tung Estate and Mun Tung Estate since 25 March 2019 according to the proposal put forward during consultation. The frequencies of route nos. E32A and E31 departing from Tung Chung in the morning of Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays) had been enhanced since 26 April 2019. The frequency of route no. E32A had been enhanced to every 12 to 15 minutes per headway and the service period during which route no. E31 operated at a headway of 15 minutes was also extended. On the same day, the frequency of route no. E42P was also increased to four trips from Monday to Friday (excluding public holidays) and three trips on Saturday (excluding public holidays), travelling from Tung Chung to Sha Tin via Tsing Yi.)

IX. Question on request for introducing Long Win monthly passes and franchised bus route heading directly to Lok Ma Chau border
(Paper T&TC 26/2019)

75. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss Natalie YU, Senior Transport Officer/Bus/Lantau of TD; Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win; Mr Mistral SIN, Manager (Planning) and Mr Brian NG, Chief Planning Officer of Citybus/NWFB; as well as Mr Albert LEUNG, Manager (Operation Department II-Traffic) of Citybus to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of Long Win had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

76. Mr LAU Chin-pang briefly presented the question. He supplemented that many residents had reflected that there was no franchised bus route heading directly to Lok Ma Chau border, and it was very inconvenient to travel from Tung Chung to the mainland via Lok Ma Chau border. Although residents might choose to travel by the non-franchised bus route departing from Citygate to Huanggang Control Point, the single journey fare of the bus route was as high as about \$60. Therefore, residents hoped that a franchised bus route heading directly to Lok Ma Chau border from Tung Chung could be introduced.

77. Miss Natalie YU responded as follows:

- (a) The Government had all along been encouraging the franchised bus companies and other public transport service operators to lower the fare or offer concessions as far as possible to help reducing passengers' travelling expenses, taking into account the operators' respective operating and financial conditions, overall economic environment and passenger needs. In line with the spirit of free enterprise, the provision of fare concessions, such as monthly ticket concession scheme, was the commercial decision of the individual franchised bus companies.
- (b) Regarding the request for introducing a new route plying between Tung Chung and Lok Ma Chau boundary control point, TD would strive to provide convenient public transport services for members of the public to travel to

various districts, when planning for provision of public transport services. However, considerations had to be given to whether the provision of related service comply with the principle of effective use of resources. Moreover, TD also needed to consider various factors, including whether the concerned areas had sufficient passenger demand; availability of alternative public transport services for residents and the current service level of the existing public transport services; the feasibility of the proposed route and the possible traffic impact that it brought about; and the possible vehicle-induced roadside air pollution, etc.

- (c) Residents in Tung Chung at present might take Long Win route no. E34B and interchange for KMB route no. B1 for travelling to the Lok Ma Chau Spur Line PTI. Given that the Spur Line PTI was located in a conservation area where stringent restriction on vehicular traffic had to be observed. In addition, it needed to accommodate the increasing school bus services for cross-boundary students with very limited size, it was very difficult to make space for new bus or minibus routes.

78. Mr Rayson LAW said that Long Win noted the request for introducing monthly bus passes and would review the feasibility of the proposal subject to financial affordability. He briefly presented Long Win's written reply to the proposal of introducing franchised bus route heading directly to Lok Ma Chau border.

79. Mr Mistral SIN said that if the Government intended to introduce franchised bus service plying between Tung Chung and Lok Ma Chau border in the future, Citybus would be glad to explore the feasibility of providing the service.

80. Mr LAU Chin-pang said that Long Win had always been one of the most reliable bus service operators to residents in Tung Chung despite the expensive bus fare. For this reason, Mr Bill TANG had time and again proposed that Long Win should introduce monthly bus passes to alleviate residents' burden of travelling expenses. However, Long Win had always rejected the proposal and even applied for a fare increase of 8.5% recently, further increasing the travel burden on the residents in Tung Chung. As KMB had already introduced monthly bus passes, he suggested that Long Win, being a subsidiary company, should follow suit. If Long Win was unable to introduce monthly bus passes in a comprehensive manner for the time being, it should at least introduce student monthly passes. He enquired whether Long Win had explored the feasibility of introducing monthly bus passes and whether financial and technical factors had been considered.

81. Mr LEE Ka-ho said that residents in Tung Chung and Lantau Island had a large demand for Long Win bus service. At present, the means of public transport for residents to travel to urban areas were limited to the MTR and Long Win buses. Therefore, the fare levels of MTR and Long Win would directly affect the travelling expenses incurred on residents. He and other Members had repeatedly requested Long Win to introduce monthly bus passes and TD had time and again indicated that it would encourage the bus companies to introduce concessionary measures. So, he asked what substantive action TD had taken to encourage Long Win to offer concessions, and suggested that the Government should consider directly providing bus fare subsidy to residents on Lantau Island or directly subsidising Long Win to introduce concessionary measures, aiming to alleviate the burden on residents.

82. Mr Rayson LAW said that IDC had discussed the item of offering monthly bus ticket concessions at the meeting on 17 December 2018. At that time, Long Win indicated that it noted the views and would explore the feasibility of offering monthly bus ticket concessions according to the company's overall financial condition. It was difficult to directly compare the ticketing arrangements between KMB and Long Win because they were granted different franchises and operated different kinds of bus routes. Long Win had taken note of Members' views and would further review the feasibility of offering monthly bus ticket concessions.

83. Mr Bill TANG said that according to the fare adjustment mechanism that allowed the fares to go upwards and downwards, any profit achieved by a franchised bus operator exceeding the rate of return of 8.7% had to be shared equally between the operator and passengers. Whenever Members requested the bus company to offer fare concessions to residents in Tung Chung who worked in urban areas according to the rebate mechanism, the bus company always used the provision of special monthly bus ticket concessions to airport staff as an excuse to reject Members' request. However, the above mentioned concession did not benefit the commuters residing in Tung Chung. As KMB had offered monthly pass concessions and enhanced the scheme, it was apparent that bus companies were capable to offer monthly ticket concessions. Moreover, the artificial island of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) had brought a large volume of passengers and much profits to Long Win. He therefore requested Long Win to expeditiously offer monthly pass concessions to residents on Lantau Island.

84. Miss Natalie YU said that the Government had provided transport facilities such as bus terminals and PTIs to meet the operational needs of bus companies. Moreover, the Government had exempted franchised bus companies from paying diesel duty since the 1990s to relieve their pressure for fare adjustments. The Government had to ensure that public money was properly spent and had no plan to subsidise franchised bus companies to offer monthly ticket concessionary schemes.

(Mr Bill TANG joined the meeting at around 4:20 p.m.)

X. Question on request for provision of noise barriers on North Lantau Highway near Tung Chung North
(Paper T&TC 16/2019)

85. The Acting Chairman welcomed Mr WAN Chi-kin, District Engineer/Islands of HyD to the meeting to respond to the question.

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

87. Mr WAN Chi-kin said that HyD did not conduct regular monitoring of the noise level on North Lantau Highway (NLH), and the Major Works Project Management Office had no plan to provide noise barriers at the section of NLH near Tung Chung North for the time being. However, HyD had liaised with the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) regarding Members' concern and would further follow up with EPD on issues such as the housing estates affected basing on the information obtained at the meeting.

88. Mr YIP Pui-kei said that Ying Yuet House and Ying Hei House in Ying Tung Estate were situated near the highway, and many residents suffered from noise nuisance at night. Despite the speed limit on NLH was set at 110 kilometres per hour (km/h), the noise level caused by motor vehicles was by no means lower than that of other highways. Noise barriers were installed on other highways but not on NLH after procrastination for a long time, causing continuous noise nuisance to the households. He requested HyD to notify EPD, and recommended that it should regularly monitor the noise level on NLH and report the progress to Members as appropriate.

89. Mr Holden CHOW said that with an ever increasing population in Tung Chung, the traffic on NLH had become increasingly heavy, resulting in complaints from residents about continuous noise from vehicles. He opined that after conducting an overall assessment, the department should promptly monitor the noise level of the entire NLH to examine and assess the locations where provision of noise barriers was needed to mitigate the noise pollution.

90. Mr Bill TANG said that regarding provision of noise barriers, although the Government had announced the implementation of relevant measures to alleviate noise nuisance, many roads meeting the conditions had not been installed with noise barriers so far. Besides, in recent years, minor works projects could commence only after the implementation of large-scale projects nearby. Given the Government's vigorous development of North Lantau Island and Tung Chung New Town in recent years, he proposed to incorporate the installation of noise barriers on NLH into the TCNTE project so as to take forward minor works projects under major infrastructural developments.

91. Mr WAN Chi-kin said that he would relay Members' views to EPD.

92. The Acting Chairman hoped that HyD and EPD would promptly conduct a study on Members' proposal of installing noise barriers on the section of NLH near Tung Chung North.

XI. Question on temporary coach parking spaces on Yu Tung Road
(Paper T&TC 19/2019)

93. The Acting Chairman welcomed Ms YUEN Kit-fung, Engineer/Islands 2 of TD; and Mr CHEN Hao-ting, Ambrose, Environmental Protection Officer (Mobile Source) 31 of EPD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of EPD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

94. Mr Eric KWOK briefly presented the question.

95. Ms YUEN Kit-fung responded as follows:

- (a) TD had been closely monitoring the traffic condition on the roads in Tung Chung area. Having conducted a site visit to Yu Tung Road earlier, TD considered that the coach parking spaces had not adversely affected the traffic condition and road safety upon occupation of Mun Tung Estate or caused obstruction to road users. In addition, there was demand for parking spaces at the concerned

location. TD had no plan to remove the coach parking spaces on Yu Tung Road for the time being.

- (b) Regarding the temporary car park near MTR Sunny Bay Station, according to TD's survey records in 2017, the temporary car park provided 28 coach parking spaces with a daily average of nine coaches parked. The survey records in 2018 was not available for the time being.
- (c) To meet the demand for parking spaces in the area from residents in Tung Chung, TD would review a vacant government land near Hei Tung Street to temporary public car park. With the assistance from the District Lands Office, Islands (DLO/Islands), TD had implemented the plan to lease the temporary public car park under a short-term tenancy (STT) by open tender. TD had also proposed to provide parking spaces for large vehicles in the temporary public car park to meet the demand for parking of individual types of vehicles. However, during public consultation, objections were received from some residents who were worried that the temporary public car park would cause noise nuisance to the residence nearby. Having examined the comments of residents and the departments concerned, TD planned to provide only private car parking spaces in the temporary public car park at Hei Tung Street, with no parking spaces for goods vehicles and coaches. TD had requested DLO/Islands to help identify suitable land in Tung Chung area. Various departments concerned would then examine whether the proposed site was suitable for use as a temporary public car park for parking of large vehicles.
- (d) The Government's current policy in the provision of parking spaces was to accord priority to considering and meeting the parking demand of commercial vehicles (CVs). Review would be conducted as appropriate to provide appropriate number of private car parking spaces.
- (e) TD had been keeping a close watch to the parking need in various districts, and had conducted a consultancy study on parking space for CVs in December 2017. The purpose of the study was to conduct an in-depth survey on the demand and supply of parking and loading/unloading facilities for CVs in various districts across the territory (including Tung Chung area) up to 2031, and formulate short-, medium- and long-term measures to address the demand for parking and loading/unloading of CVs.

96. Mr Ambrose CHEN presented EPD's written reply in detail.

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

- (a) He had raised a question on parking spaces on Yu Tung Road at the meeting of T&TC on 19 November 2018, and many Members had also reflected the problem to TD in the past. Although the number of residents of Mun Tung Estate which started population intake last year was small, the population of the housing estate would keep increasing in the future, coupled with the re-routing

of bus routes for service enhancement, the vehicular flow on Yu Tung Road would definitely increase.

- (b) He did not agree with TD's saying that the implementation of one-way traffic on Yu Tung Road would not have negative impact on the traffic. He opined that one-way traffic would adversely affect the access of vehicles, and the consequences would be unimaginable in the event of traffic accident. He remarked that TD should take precautionary measures to ensure that traffic gridlock would not occur on roads within Tung Chung area due to individual traffic accidents.
- (c) Numerous Members had requested for relocating of the 13 coach parking spaces on Yu Tung Road. The 13 coach parking spaces seemed to have indirectly encouraged coaches to travel to Tung Chung during public holidays, resulting in the parking of far more than 13 coaches at the location and the consequential illegal parking of coaches beside the designated parking spaces. He therefore urged TD to identify alternative locations for re-provisioning of the 13 coach parking spaces to release the lane to ensure smooth road traffic and reduce illegal parking of vehicles.

98. Ms Amy YUNG said TD just stated that the statistical data on use of the temporary car park near MTR Sunny Bay Station by coaches in 2018 was not available for the time being. In the previous T&TC meetings, she had repeatedly raised the problem of traffic congestion caused by illegal parking of large vehicles on roads. She enquired why TD was still unable to provide the statistical findings in 2018 for the time being, and thought that TD should obtain the data on the use of the concerned car park from the operator. She requested TD to follow up on the problem and provide Members with the relevant data after the meeting.

99. Mr FAN Chi-ping expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He enquired whether TD had conducted site inspection on Yu Tung Road. He indicated that the parking problem was serious at the location and, as estimated, about 50 to 60 vehicles including goods vehicles, private cars and so on were parked from Yu Tung Road all the way to the vicinity of the entrance of Chung Yan Road. He had provided the photographs showing the parking situation at the concerned location to the Police and TD a few years ago, and requested TD to conduct site inspection to the said location at noon. However, TD had turned a blind eye to the problem, and the Police sometimes failed to properly handle the problem due to shortage of manpower. He enquired whether TD had paid any attention to the actual situation at the concerned location over the years, and whether site inspection had been conducted to the said location.
- (b) He said that the 13 coach parking spaces on Yu Tung Road were designated for use by coaches only, and no parking spaces were provided for other types of vehicles, thereby creating the problem of illegal parking. The entrance of Ma Wan Chung Village was always blocked by a large number of large vehicles with cross-boundary licence at present, and some drivers even parked their vehicles at roadside to take rest, keeping the engines running, which caused

pollution to the surrounding environment and adversely affected the pedestrians. He opined that a multi-storey car park should be provided in Tung Chung area, or else the problem of parking of vehicles would remain unsolved.

100. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He pointed out that at least an average of 40 coaches were parked on the two lanes of Yu Tung Road linking Mun Tung Estate and Tung Chung town centre while some were even parked on Chung Yan Road, obstructing buses from pulling over at the bus stop. At an earlier meeting of Islands District Fire Safety Committee, he had pointed out that, as reflected by some residents, coaches parked on Yu Tung Road would cause obstruction to fire engines from using fire hydrant to put off fire. He considered the design of Yu Tung Road unsuitable for parking of coaches, but TD had legalised the arrangement. He urged TD to remove the temporary coach parking spaces on Yu Tung Road and turn Yu Tung Road into a two-lane carriageway. He also urged the Police and EPD to step up law enforcement and restrict the number of parked vehicles to a maximum of 13 in order to combat illegal parking.
- (b) Tung Chung new town development was underway with reclamation and infrastructure works in full swing. He thought that TD should explore with CEDD to plan for a large multi-storey car park in the area to tie in with the new development of Tung Chung. Moreover, as many coaches would be attracted to Tung Chung by HZMB, the consequence would become increasingly serious if TD did not squarely face the problem.
- (c) The planning of the public car park on Hei Tung Street included coach parking spaces, but objections from residents were received during consultation. He suggested that TD should plan and assess all possible consequences well in advance prior to any planning in the future.

101. Ms YUEN Kit-fung responded as follows:

- (a) After learning that the public car park on Hei Tung Street would not allow parking of large vehicles, TD had sought assistance from DLO/Islands in identifying other sites in Tung Chung area and examined with the departments concerned whether the proposed location was suitable for use as a STT public car park for parking of large vehicles. TD would continue to follow up with the departments concerned with a view to identifying a new site for use as a STT public car park within a short time.
- (b) Given that the Government's policy in the provision of parking spaces was to accord priority to considering and meeting the parking demand of CVs, TD launched a consultancy study on CV parking spaces since 2017, and CVs in Tung Chung area were covered in the study. The scope of study included the demand for parking and loading/unloading facilities of various types of vehicles such as coaches and goods vehicles. TD would proactively consider the

situation in Tung Chung area and provide the relevant facilities with a view to solving the parking problem in the area.

- (c) TD understood that many Members were concerned about the current parking situation on Yu Tung Road. The department conducted monitoring at scene from time to time and found that the problem of illegal parking was serious, thus had all along collaborated with and requested the Police to step up enforcement action. According to recent survey records, the problem of illegal parking on Yu Tung Road had been alleviated. As a result, vehicles travelling to Yu Tung Road were not affected and the traffic had become smooth. In view of this, TD wanted to retain the existing on-street coach parking spaces on Yu Tung Road for public use. TD noted the keen demand for parking spaces in Tung Chung area and would continue to closely monitor the situation.
- (d) Regarding the information about parking of large vehicles in the temporary car park near the MTR Sunny Bay Station mentioned by Ms Amy YUNG a moment ago, she said that her colleague only provided the statistical data of 2017. She would follow up with the relevant colleague on the records of 2018 and provide Members with the supplementary data after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: According to the records of survey on temporary car parks in 2018 submitted by the consultant in April 2019, the temporary car park near MTR Sunny Bay Station provided 28 coach parking spaces with a daily average of nine coaches parked.)

102. Mr Bill TANG expressed his views as follows:

- (a) The Government flexibly opened up road sections in the community for parking of CVs according to three principles: firstly, only CVs could be parked in the road sections concerned; secondly, parking of vehicles were permitted only at night time; and thirdly, the road sections concerned should be located within the commercial areas. Nevertheless, since most road sections of Yu Tung Road had become the essential paths to the residential areas, TD should promptly tackle the problem of parking on Yu Tung Road.
- (b) He was discontented with TD for imposing restrictions on public transport service in the district for accommodating the current situation. Many residents reflected to him that request was made to TD for increasing the frequency of NLB route no. 39M but to no avail. Anticipating that more residents would move in Mun Tung Estate after the Easter holidays, he urged TD and the bus company to consider increasing the frequency of route no. 39M and not to restrict bus frequency in the area for reason of maintaining smooth traffic flow on Yu Tung Road.

103. Ms YUEN Kit-fung responded as follows:

- (a) TD noted Members' concern, in particular the demand for parking of large vehicles in Tung Chung area, and would closely monitor the traffic condition on Yu Tung Road.
- (b) She remarked that public transport service in the area was unrelated to the existing coach parking spaces on Yu Tung Road, and TD would monitor the situation as appropriate.

(Mr YUEN King-hang left the meeting at around 4:35 p.m.)

XII. Question on abandoned shared bicycles (Paper T&TC 20/2019)

104. The Acting Chairman welcomed Ms YUEN Kit-fung, Engineer/Islands 2 of TD; Mr WAN Chi-kin, District Engineer/Islands of HyD; Mr KWOK Chi-hang, Administrative Assistant/Lands and Mr SZETO Hor-keung, Senior Land Executive/Land Control of DLO/Islands; Mr Benjamin AU, Assistant District Officer (Islands)1 of Islands District Office (IsDO); and Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung, District Operations Officer (Lantau) of HKPF to the meeting to respond to the question. The written replies of TD, DLO/Islands and IsDO had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting. OFO (HK) Limited (OFO), bicycle-sharing service operator, was unable to arrange representative to attend the meeting but had provided a written reply for Members' perusal.

105. Mr Holden CHOW briefly presented the question.

106. Ms YUEN Kit-fung briefly presented the written reply.

107. Mr WAN Chi-kin said that IsDO would co-ordinate with the departments concerned such as relevant DLO, TD, HKPF and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD), and arrange for joint clearance operations for illegally placed bicycles or objects in accordance with the situation. HyD did not participate in the operations.

108. Mr SZETO Hor-keung briefly presented the written reply.

109. Mr Benjamin AU said that as stated in TD's written reply, TD, HKPF and the Lands Department would arrange for clearance operations according to their respective duties. When complicated and serious cases were encountered, IsDO would co-ordinate various departments concerned to conduct joint clearance operations for illegally placed bicycles or objects according to the situation.

110. Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung said that the Police would continue to assist various departments in mounting joint clearance operations for bicycles to ensure that the operations were conducted smoothly.

111. Mr Holden CHOW said that some automated bicycle rental service operators which were about to cease operation such as OFO failed to comply with the Code of Practice in accordance with the signed Memorandum of Understanding, putting the burden of clearing

illegally parked bicycles on the Government. Several shared bicycles were previously abandoned on the slope of Fu Tung Estate in Tung Chung, and were removed by the government department in the end. The departments just stressed that joint clearance operations would be mounted to remove illegally placed bicycles or objects, and therefore he proposed that a department should assume the leading role in this respect.

112. Mr YIP Pui-kei said the written reply only stressed that the departments would conduct joint clearance operations but no response to the question on regulatory measures was given. He asked the departments concerned to give response. He learnt that FEHD regularly removed illegally displayed slogans and issued tickets to the offenders. He asked, after clearance of illegally parked bicycles, whether the departments concerned would charge the offenders for the clearance and storage. Although Gobee.bike had closed down its business, bicycles of the company could still be found at various places in Tung Chung. He asked whether the expense for handling the bicycles was borne by public funds. It was also mentioned in the question that some shared bicycles with their electronic locks removed were parked at roadside or occupying bicycle parking spaces. He enquired what residents should do after identifying such irregularities, and whether they should report to the Police for follow-up.

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

- (a) He asked whether a mechanism of mounting joint operations was in place, if yes, which was the responsible department. He also enquired about the figures of joint operations conducted over the past year.
- (b) He enquired whether the departments would take legal action after removal of illegally parked bicycles, and whether they had instituted prosecution against the concerned operators or charged them for handling the bicycles. As Gobee.bike had wound up its business, he asked who was responsible for clearing the company's abandoned bicycles. He hoped that TD would learn from lessons and draw up measures well in advance to prevent shared bicycle operators from abandoning their bicycles casually after cessation of business.
- (c) He enquired whether it was an offence for a person to remove the electronic lock from a shared bicycle and keep the bicycle for his/her own, and how the department concerned would handle such cases.

114. Mr Bill TANG expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Regarding the problem of abandoned bicycles caused by the winding up of the operators' business, he understood that the concerned department had formulated corresponding communication mechanism and guidelines. He enquired whether the guidelines required the operators to give notification to the concerned government departments within a specified period prior to the closing down of business. If yes, how long the specified period was.
- (b) If a bicycle was willfully damaged, the accuracy of its Global Positioning System device might be adversely affected. Although the desing of bicycles of

various operators might differ from one another, it was not completely impossible to trace a bicycle with its electronic lock removed. About half a year ago, an operator detected an attempt to steal bicycle parts and reported to the Police for arresting the offenders. However, he was worried that the operators would only make use of the tracking technology to protect the company properties and had no intention to assist in handling bicycles abandoned at roadside. He enquired whether TD had obtained more information about the technology from the operators.

- (c) He enquired whether the operators had regularly reported to TD the progress and management in respect of the recovery of abandoned bicycles.

115. Mr KWOK Chi-hang said that during joint operations, DLO would post a statutory notice on each illegally parked bicycle under Section 6 of the Land (Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance (Cap. 28) requiring the occupier to cease the occupation of government land before the date specified therein, otherwise, the Government would remove the illegally parked bicycles according to law. DLO had all along maintained a close communication with the District Office (DO), and would take part in joint operations against complicated and serious cases of illegal parking of bicycles.

116. Mr Benjamin AU said that relevant departments would arrange for clearance operations according to their respective purview. On complicated and serious cases, relevant DO would co-ordinate various departments, such as DLO, TD, the Police and FEHD to conduct joint operations as appropriate. Relevant DLO would remove illegally placed bicycles or objects according to Section 6 of the Land (Miscellaneous Provisions) Ordinance (Cap. 28). On the other hand, under the District-led Actions Scheme, IsDO and the concerned departments conducted joint operations to remove illegally parked bicycles at “priority sites” proposed by Members. He would provide the number of joint operations conducted in the past year after the meeting.

117. The Acting Chairman opined that the locations where shared bicycles were illegally parked at present were within the ambit of DLO, and TD did not have the power to carry out clearance thereat.

(Post-meeting note: IsDO had co-ordinated 18 joint clearance operations for illegally parked bicycles between April 2018 and March 2019.)

118. Mr KWOK Chi-hang said that there were various kinds of cases of unlawful occupation of government land, such as occupation of government land for warehouse storage or maintenance workshop uses. These cases fell within DLO’s core enforcement responsibilities. Moreover, in response to other government departments’ operations and subject to DLO’s resources and work priorities, DLO would take part in joint departmental enforcement actions such as joint clearance operations against illegal parking of bicycles.

119. The Acting Chairman hoped that the departments concerned would take prompt action to solve the problem of casually abandoned shared bicycles.

XIII. Question on tender for the Cheung Chau-Central ferry route and the Government owning a ferry fleet
(Paper T&TC 21/2019)

120. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss HO Kit-ying, Florence, Senior Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry 2 of TD to the meeting to respond to the question.

121. Mr KWONG Koon-wan briefly presented the question.

122. Miss Florence HO responded as follows:

- (a) It was the Government's established policy that public transport services should be run by the private sector in accordance with commercial principles to enhance efficiency and cost-effectiveness. TD would comprehensively consider various factors when processing the applications for fare increase of ferry service.
- (b) There was no direct subsidy from the Government for public transport services save for the six major outlying island ferry routes. Given the difficult operating environment of ferry service in general, the Government provided Special Helping Measures (SHM) to these outlying island ferry routes because there was basically no alternative to the ferry services available as a means of public transport.
- (c) The ferry service plying between Central and Cheung Chau was currently operated by New World First Ferry Services Limited (NWFF), and this ferry route was one of the six major outlying island ferry routes provided with SHM. The Government would conduct a mid-term review in the first half of 2019 on the six major outlying island ferry routes for the three-year licence period from 2017 to 2020 to ensure proper spending of public funds, and consider lowering ferry fares when operating costs were reduced. The Government would deal with the licence-related matters in line with past practice.
- (d) When the Government conducted the said mid-term review, it would review in one go whether the SHM was the most desirable long-term operation model for maintaining the financial viability of ferry services. The review would also cover the feasibility of providing full subsidy to ferry operators for replacement of vessels. The objective was to ensure service quality, long-term financial sustainability of ferry operation, and a reasonable adjustment of fares. The Government would also explore whether SHM or other arrangements should be applied to the eight other outlying island ferry routes. The Government expected to announce the results of the review in the first half of 2019, and would report the details to LegCo and IDC at that time. She welcomed Members to offer opinions to TD on the long-term operation model of the outlying island ferry services.
- (e) The licence of "Central-Cheung Chau" ferry route was the extension of that awarded to NWFF for a first three-year period through open tender in 2011. Upon consultation and with the support from LegCo and IDC, TD extended the

licence of the ferry service plying between Central and Cheung Chau in 2014 and 2017 respectively for a period of three years. The current licence period 2017-2020 would be expired on 30 June 2020 and by then, the licence period of the ferry route would be added up to nine years. According to the Ferry Services Ordinance (Cap. 104), the period for which the licence was granted together with all extensions shall not in any case exceed in the aggregate a period of 10 years. In this connection, the licence period of the ferry route plying between Central and Cheung Chau could be extended to 30 June 2021 at most, and then a new operator would be selected to operate the ferry route through open tender.

- (f) Since there were many uncertainties in the overall business environment of the ferry trade, it was more appropriate and had been effective to operate the relevant ferry routes through licensing. While maintaining the necessary ferry services, the operators might make appropriate adjustments in the light of changes in the market of ferry services. To encourage and facilitate ferry operators to make long-term investment and operational plans for enhancement of the financial viability and service level of ferry service, the Government had previously extended the maximum ferry service licence period from three years to five years through legislative amendment, while the aggregate licence period was still capped at 10 years.
- (g) One of the current conditions of tender for ferry operation was that the tenderers had to provide a suitable ferry fleet for operation at the beginning of the licence period, so that the ferry service level required for tendering, which was drawn up upon the consultation with DC, could be met. When formulating the conditions of tender, TD would consider all relevant factors, such as demand and opinion of passengers, daily operation of the ferry service, pier facilities, as well as the results of the review on the long-term operation model of the outlying island ferry routes. The Government would consult LegCo and IDC upon announcement of the results of the review.
- (h) On regulating the ferry service, the existing mechanism had been effective. According to Section 31 of the Ferry Services Ordinance (Cap. 104), the licensee of ferry service shall, at all times during the licence period, maintain to the satisfaction of TD a proper and efficient ferry service. TD had all along regulated ferry services in a continuous and strict manner through various measures, including conducting surprise inspection, examining periodic financial statements submitted by the operators, carrying out on-site surveys on a whole-day basis or in peak hours, collecting public opinion, and conducting joint site inspection with the operators or relevant government departments. In the case of unsatisfactory performance, TD would require the operator to make improvement. If the operator failed to make improvement as appropriate without any reasonable excuse, TD might consider revoking the licence of the concerned operator.
- (i) When conducting tendering exercise of ferry service or renewal of licence, TD would consider the views from DC and local community. When assessing

whether an operator was capable of operating the ferry service, TD would consider whether the operator could ascertain to provide the required number of vessels at the beginning of the licence period instead of requiring it to own a ferry fleet during the tendering.

123. Mr KWONG Koon-wan expressed his views as follows:

- (a) As the representative of TD had just stated, the ferry service plying between Central and Cheung Chau would continue to operate through a licensing after the next tendering exercise. If the service quality of the operator did not meet the standard, TD had the right to revoke the operator's licence. However, since the fleet was the asset of the operator, TD could not take over its operating fleet. Therefore, if the Government owned its own ferry fleet and provided the service through franchise, TD could take over the fleet according to the decision of the Executive Council, and hand over the fleet to a new operator to continue the service provision, which would be conducive to improvement of the quality of ferry service. Nevertheless, according to the representative of TD's earlier response, it seemed that TD did not tend to accept this proposal of the former Chief Executive. He hoped that the Government could conduct a study on the mechanism of owning a ferry fleet, and requested the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) or TD to give response.
- (b) He said that NWFF had just published a tender document for "procurement of used aluminum alloy catamaran" specifying a tender period of seven days. He considered a tender period of seven days unreasonable and indicated that the public sector would generally set at tender period of 21 to 40 days to allow sufficient time for interested companies to submit the relevant documents. Since the Government provided subsidy to ferry operators for maintenance of old vessels, NWFF might have the chance of obtaining the subsidy after procuring used vessels by tender. He was worried that some companies would exercise asset transfer through such tendering with short tender period by selling used vessels to NWFF, which would then repair the vessels with the Government's subsidy and resell them after a few years at a profit. He remarked that the tender conditions set out in the tender document seemed to be targeting at a certain type of vessels. He did not understand why a short tender period of only seven days was given, and pointed out that the tender periods given by NWFF in the past exceeded seven days. He considered the matter very serious, and was concerned that it might involve insider trading. He hoped that T&TC would write to THB requesting it to pay attention to the tendering concerned.
- (c) As stated by the representative of TD a moment ago, LegCo or DC Members would be further consulted upon the announcement of the results of the tendering. He thought that this would be a notification rather than consultation of Members, and the tender procedure involving TD and ferry operators could not be monitored. In his estimation, there might be only one ferry operator (i.e. NWFF) submitting tender in 2021 for operating the ferry service between Central and Cheung Chau. For this reason, the ferry fare would not decrease

in 2021. He requested TD or THB to seriously handle the matter, preventing public funds of the Government from being used improperly by merchants.

124. Ms LEE Kwai-chun expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She wanted to seize the opportunity to raise questions about the frequency of ferry service in the morning. She said that although the ferry service between Central and Cheung Chau had been improved, the sailing departing from Cheung Chau at 8:10 a.m. was of low patronage as most residents chose to take the 8:20 a.m. sailing. She enquired whether a large vessel could be allocated to operate the 8:10 a.m. sailing so as to carry more passengers.
- (b) Many residents reflected that the 4:45 p.m. sailing departing from Cheung Chau had high patronage and thus they always could not take the ferry. She believed that a review should be conducted to see why a vessel of inadequate carrying capacity was allocated to provide service.
- (c) Passengers needed to queue and wait for ferries at the pier. They could embark on the ferry only after all passengers of the ferry had disembarked, but the pier did not have sufficient space. She requested TD to explore solutions to the above problem.

125. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She remarked that ferry services were the only means of transport for outlying islands, but not many ferry operators in Hong Kong owned a ferry fleet, resulting in monopoly of the ferry trade. Under such circumstances, the winner of the tendering was just all too obvious, especially for operation of ferry routes of high patronage. She therefore considered it necessary to formulate policies for gate-keeping of all tenders, with a view to safeguarding the rights and interests of the public according to the principle of equity and enabling normal operation of private enterprises through fair competition.
- (b) Members had time and again raised questions on ferry service at T&TC meetings, and TD had also repeatedly replied at meetings that their Treasury Accountants would examine the relevant accounts. Nevertheless, she expressed dissatisfaction to TD's Treasury Accountants, holding that they failed to observe the actual situation. For example, a listed company suffered a loss of about \$9 million to \$10 million in net asset value due to the burning down of its ferry during maintenance in the shipyard. Since the insurance company did not make any compensation after investigation, the ferry operator attempted to transfer the loss to passengers by increasing ferry fare, thereby increasing the passengers' financial burden. She considered such practice unfair and hoped that the transparency of ferry operation could be enhanced. In another example, a ferry operator engaged in activities other than ferry service by using its resources, benefiting the parent company. The above situations were not uncommon, and Members and the public were aware of them. Unfortunately, TD's Treasury Accountants seemed to have no idea of any of these problems.

She therefore urged the Government to enhance its gate-keeping role and increase the transparency of tendering and operation of ferry companies.

126. Mr Randy YU expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He said that, as stated in the former Chief Executive's Policy Address published during his term, study on establishing a government ferry fleet would be conducted, aiming to provide an alternative of transport service for residents on outlying islands other than that provided by ferry companies or operators. As mentioned by the representative of TD a while ago, companies owning a ferry fleet or not might participate in tendering. He was worried that if a company did not have its own fleet and only procured vessels from other companies after being awarded with the tender, it would be highly risky. He opined that it was difficult for a tenderer without a ferry fleet to develop a suitable operation model, such as the anticipated daily sailings to Cheung Chau or Mui Wo required, which could only be estimated by existing ferry companies. He said that the existing ferry types and schedule arrangement were specifically adopted for the existing operators. Taking the ferry service for Tai O as an example, although Fortune Ferry Company Limited and its parent company Chu Kong Shipping Enterprises (Holdings) Company Limited were capable and eligible for participation in tendering, the tendering criteria were not attractive to other ferry companies, and thus could not enhance the competition among ferry companies.
- (b) He said that the quality of ferry service was now at a standstill and the existing tendering arrangement could not flexibly deal with or reflect the problems already in existence. NWFF had conducted a survey on the ferry route plying between Mui Wo and Central, and the findings showed that there was still a surplus capacity of about 5% to 10%. That said, among 700 households of the new housing estates in Mui Wo, only about 100 households had moved in. Upon the occupation of all flats, a heavy burden on the ferry route would be generated. He guessed that NWFF's procurement of used vessels through tendering aimed to provide ferry service to the 700 households newly moved to Mui Wo. He doubted why NWFF did not procure brand new vessels instead of used ones, but he was not in the position to comment on its commercial decisions.
- (c) As he thought, the Government should own a ferry fleet for provision of ferry service by experienced ferry operators through tendering instead of providing subsidy to ferry operators for maintenance of old vessels. Mr KWONG Koon-wan had just pointed out the difference in operating ferry service through franchise system and licence system. Since the operation of outlying island ferry routes required a licence, residents did not have any alternative. He said Members had time and again stressed at T&TC meetings that ferry services were the only means of transport for residents of outlying islands, and there was no other transport infrastructure for travelling to their residence. He asked why the Government still did not provide a ferry fleet for residents on outlying islands, and was greatly disappointed at the Government for not conducting any study on owning a ferry fleet. He indicated that the Policy Address published years

ago had proposed to conduct a study on setting up a Government fleet for residents on outlying islands, but no progress was yet to be seen so far. He did not understand why the Administration hastily indicated that it was not necessary to own a ferry fleet while no progress had been made regarding the proposed study. He requested THB and TD to respond to why the study on setting up a ferry fleet by the Government was still not launched.

127. Miss Florence HO responded as follows:

- (a) Since the cost of operating a fleet was high, the Government provided SHM to six ferry routes at present. TD noted Members' views and would consider them during the mid-term review, including whether provision of SHM was the most desirable long-term operation model to maintain financial viability of ferry service. TD would also explore the feasibility of providing full subsidy to the ferry operators for replacement of new vessels and announce the result once available.
- (b) On SHM, the Government had required that before carrying out maintenance work for the vessels, operators of the six ferry routes should conduct open tender exercise or invite quotations from maintenance agents in order to select a suitable agent to provide related maintenance service. The operators were also required to submit to TD relevant documents such as invoices certified by external accountants for reimbursement of subsidy in relation to vessel maintenance cost.
- (c) As just mentioned, the licence for the ferry route plying between Cheung Chau and Central could be extended to 2021 at most. After that, TD would select a new operator to operate the ferry route plying between Cheung Chau and Central through open tender. TD noted Members' views and would, in the light of the concerns about the service level and frequency of the ferry route raised by Members, explore whether relevant tender conditions should be included for making improvement.

128. Ms LEE Kwai-chun said TD just stated that it would inform LegCo and IDC of the results of the review, but she had never received any such information from TD. Besides, as TD occasionally carried out field surveys by interviewing passengers at the piers, she enquired about the practical use of the field surveys.

129. Miss Florence HO said that TD monitored the service level of ferry operators by various means. The objective of conducting on-site surveys was to monitor the service performance of the operators, such as whether the operators had provided service according to the Schedules of Services, the ferry operation and passenger demand, etc. If TD identified during on-site surveys that the operators' service was not satisfactory, TD would require the operators to take measures for improvement. Furthermore, upon receipt of complaints from the local community or members of the public, TD would conduct on-site survey or surprise inspection and, where necessary, conduct review for improvement of service.

130. Mr KWONG Koon-wan expressed his views as follows:

- (a) After learning that TD wanted to operate the ferry routes in accordance with commercial principles, Members had requested the Government to establish its own ferry fleet, hoping to significantly reduce the tender threshold. He stressed that Members only requested the Government to own rather than operate a ferry fleet, and the Government could still carry out tendering according to commercial principles to select a suitable ferry company to operate the fleet. He asked TD to carefully listen to Members' views, and not to mistake that Members requested for "nationalisation" of the ferry business.
- (b) He said that with two years left for the tendering in 2021, if TD only provided the tender document in 2020, he was concerned that the ferry companies which were interested in submitting tenders would not have adequate time for preparation. If the policy of owning a ferry fleet by the Government was still not endorsed by then and the conditions of tender specified that tenderers were required to own their ferry fleets, he was afraid that one year's time might not be sufficient for the interested tenderers to procure vessels. Besides, it took about one to two years to build a vessel at the cost of about \$50 million or so. He held that TD had to provide sufficient time for the new operators to purchase or build ships. He also indicated that TD's tender document seemed to be tailor-made for NWFF because a tender period of half a year to one year could hardly attract new tenderers. In fact, this situation had been lasting for 20 years. Even if the Government considered it feasible to form its own ferry fleet, it would still take time for it to purchase vessels, apply funding from LegCo and conduct tendering, and the ferry operators to build vessels for operating the ferry routes. It would be difficult to complete all the works within one year. On the one hand, NWFF's licence might be extended to 2021 and on the other, TD should provide opportunity to other operators to operate the ferry service.

131. Ms Josephine TSANG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She said that at T&TC meetings, Members had time and again proposed that the Government should own a ferry fleet and select a suitable ferry company to operate the fleet. The Government, however, had never listened to Members' views. She doubted whether TD was able to monitor tendering exercises in a fair and equitable manner since very few ferry companies could meet the tender requirements at present. She was also worried that if the ferry company exited from the business, the ferry service would be stopped.
- (b) She thought that TD's provision of maintenance subsidy was like throwing money into a bottomless pit because old vessels were still old vessels even after repairs. She did not understand why NWFF procured used vessels by tender, and thought that the Government was wasting public funds by subsidising ferry operators to procure used vessels. She remarked that TD had all along ignored the public opinion and continued to maintain "insider operation", preventing the passengers from having more choices.

132. Mr Randy YU expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He thought that the Government was not completely ignoring the public opinion. The former Chief Executive had proposed in the Policy Address to conduct a study on forming a Government ferry fleet, but TD seemed to have turned a deaf ear to the matter.
- (b) In the 2017 Policy Address, the former Chief Executive proposed to conduct a review on the policy of owning a ferry fleet by the Government, and suggested that any company could participate in the tendering for enhanced competition. He enquired whether the study had been launched, and whether Members would be invited to take part in the study. He thanked the representative of TD's Ferry Section for attending the meeting, but substantive replies to the above question and Members' enquiries still could not be made. He expected that TD would make further response in about four weeks. If the situation was found to be unsatisfactory, Members might put forward follow-up questions at the next T&TC meeting.

133. Mr Bill TANG said that as the issue involved tendering matter, he hoped that it would be included as a follow-up item for the next T&TC meeting so that TD could provide more information to enable Members to better understand the situation.

134. The Acting Chairman asked the Secretariat to write to THB and follow up with TD after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The Committee had written to THB and TD, conveying Members' views and requesting for written replies.)

(Mr LOU Cheuk-wing left the meeting at around 5:30 p.m.)

XIV. Question on special helping measures for outlying island ferry routes (Paper T&TC 22/2019)

135. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss Florence HO, Senior Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry 2 of TD to the meeting to respond to the question.

136. Ms Amy YUNG briefly presented the question.

137. Miss Florence HO responded as follows:

- (a) The Government was conducting a review on the long-term operation model of the 6 outlying island ferry routes to examine whether the special helping measures (SHM) would be the most desirable long-term operation model for maintaining the financial viability of ferry services. The review would cover, inter alia, a detailed study on extension of licence duration and the feasibility of providing full subsidy to ferry operators for replacement of vessels. The objectives were to ensure service quality, long-term financial sustainability of

ferry operation, and a reasonable adjustment of fares. The results were expected to be announced in the first half of 2019.

- (b) When the Government made a decision on the long-term operation model of the 6 outlying island ferry routes, it would decide in one go whether the long-term operation model to be selected at the time should be applicable to the 8 other outlying island ferry routes, including “Discovery Bay – Central” and “Ma Wan – Central” routes. The Government would consider a whole host of factors, including the principle of prudent use of public money, whether there was any alternative public transport service of each of the 8 routes, their different operating environments (for example, some of the routes were launched in support of the new residential development projects at that time) as well as the different financial situation and patronage of the 8 routes etc. The ordinance in respect of lengthening the period for which a licence to operate a ferry service may be newly granted and extended on each occasion from the original 3 years to 5 years had come into effect from November 2018.

138. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) According to what the representative of the Transport Department (TD) said just now, the Government would consider factors including whether there were alternative transport services of the ferry routes concerned. She pointed out that the patronage of “Discovery Bay – Central” route was the second highest among all ferry routes of Islands District, yet the ferry route did not benefit from the subsidies of HK\$120 million and HK\$190 million by way of the SHM introduced in 2011 and 2015 respectively. There was land transport service available between Discovery Bay and other districts, but Mui Wo which also was served by a number of road transports had its ferry service subsidised. She was perplexed that the ferry service of Discovery Bay was not covered under the SHM.
- (b) She had time and again raised the issue at Traffic and Transport Committee meetings and during the annual meeting with Legislative Council (LegCo) members, and also requested the Transport and Housing Bureau and TD to study the provision of SHM for Discovery Bay ferry service in the mid-term review. She hoped that TD would provide details of the review progress as requested in her question.

139. Miss Florence HO responded as follows:

- (a) When the Government made a decision on the long-term operation model of the 6 outlying island ferry routes, it would decide in one go whether the long-term operation model to be selected should be applicable to the 8 other outlying island ferry routes, including the “Discovery Bay – Central” route.
- (b) The review was in progress and the outcome would be announced once it was ready. It was also of the plan to brief the Legislative Council and the Islands District Council by then.

140. Mr Peter TSANG expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Since the Government announced the provision of SHM for six outlying island ferry routes in year 2011, the operator of the ferry service between Discovery Bay (DB) and Central, Discovery Bay Transportation Services Limited (DBTPL), had been striving for including the ferry route under the coverage of SHM, but no result had been achieved so far. The company thanked the enthusiastic residents in DB for making the request to THB and TD with DBTPL. The assistance from LegCo Members was also sought to request LegCo to include the ferry route plying between DB and Central and other currently excluded outlying island ferry routes in the SHM.
- (b) Understanding that the Government was conducting the relevant review, he hoped it would consider providing SHM to the other ferry routes, especially the ferry route between DB and Central which was suffering losses. The business operation environment was very difficult at present because both wages and oil prices were on the ascending trend. Under such an environment, it was difficult to predict about the future and to draw up long-term business plans. In spite of the legislative amendment made by the Government to extend the maximum licence period from three years to five years, DBTPL still applied for licence extension annually. He requested the Government to carefully consider providing SHM to the ferry route plying between DB and Central and other currently outlying ferry routes that are excluded when conducting the review.

141. Mr KWONG Koon-wan supported the SHM scheme implemented for outlying island ferry routes, but thought that inter-islands ferry routes plying among various islands should also be covered under the scheme. As stated by the representative of TD, it was very difficult to run ferry service. Nevertheless, arrangement for transport service was essential and appropriate subsidy should be provided. As compared with the expenditure of road construction in other districts, the amount of subsidy provided for ferry routes was indeed a drop in the ocean.

142. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) Since the Ferry Services (Amendment) Ordinance 2018 came into effect on 23 November 2018, the three-year licence period was extended to five years, but DBTPL still needed to apply for licence extension every year. TD would approve the application in the light of public opinion. Since only a few ferry operators could participate in the tendering, it was actually difficult for residents to give comment. Moreover, residents had no other alternative other than the DB ferry service provided by DBTPL. Through annual renewal of licence, DBTPL might increase ferry fare every year, causing residents to pay higher fares. Given the current monopoly of the ferry market and the limited regulatory measures imposed by the Government, she hoped THB would obtain further understanding of the situation.

- (b) She had raised the above question and concern whenever she met with LegCo Members. As Mr Peter TSANG had just indicated, some LegCo Members had assisted to strive for provision of SHM to outlying island ferry routes including the ferry route plying between DB and Central from LegCo, but the progress was not significant so far. She asked DBTPL whether LegCo had given any reply.

143. Miss Florence HO responded as follows:

- (a) She said that the existing “Inter-islands” ferry service plying between Cheung Chau, Peng Chau, Mui Wo and Chi Ma Wan had been included in the SHM since 2011.
- (b) TD was exploring whether SHM should be extended to the eight other outlying island ferry routes. As a matter of fact, the Government had all along been providing assistance to outlying island ferry service other than SHM, such as undertaking the repairs and maintenance of ferry piers, measures on tax exemptions, waiving licence fees and subsidise in relation to fare revenue foregone due to provision of elderly concessionary fares. Furthermore, TD had streamlined the pier subletting approval procedures, and encouraged the operators to generate non-fare box revenue.
- (c) The Government was conducting the review of the long-term operation model of the outlying island ferry routes. When the results were available, it would be announced as soon as possible and consult LegCo and IDC.

(Mr Bill TANG left the meeting at around 5:50 p.m.)

XV. Question on request for additional ferry trips plying between Yung Shue Wan and Central
(Paper T&TC 31/2019)

144. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss Florence HO, Senior Transport Officer/Planning/Ferry 2 of TD to the meeting to respond to the question.

145. Ms YU Lai-fan briefly presented the question.

146. Miss Florence HO responded as follows:

- (a) TD had always conducted on-site surveys to monitor the service level and passenger demand of the ferry route plying between Central and Yung Shue Wan. According to the reports of the on-site surveys conducted on weekdays since the second half of 2017 to date, the average occupancy rate of the sailings departing from Yung Shue Wan to Central at 6:20 a.m. and 7:00 a.m. were about 56% and 80% respectively; and the average occupancy rate of the sailings departing from Central to Yung Shue Wan at 8:30 p.m., 9:30 p.m. and 10:30 p.m. were about 53%, 67% and 58% respectively. The above results showed that the ferry

service provided in the said periods could meet the passenger demand with surplus capacity.

- (b) TD understood Members' view that the frequencies of the ferry route departing between 6:20 a.m. and 7:00 a.m. were less than that of other ferry routes during the same period. TD also noticed that on individual days, the occupancy rate of the 7:00 a.m. sailing on weekdays reached about 90%. TD would closely monitor the passenger demand in this timeslot, and would proactively explore with the operator the feasibility of providing an additional sailing at 6:40 a.m. when carrying out the mid-term review.
- (c) As Ms YU Lai-fan had just stated, residents taking the ferry at night sometimes might not be able to sit with the children or elderly persons accompanying them due to too many passengers on the ferry. TD also noticed the situation and had requested the ferry operator to step up publicity, advising passengers to be considerate and let other passengers accompanied by children or elderly persons to sit together. The ferry operator undertook to put up notices at piers or on ferries to appeal to the passengers, and planned to produce a video for playing on ferries in the second half of this year.

147. Ms YU Lai-fan expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She requested TD to proactively explore the provision of an additional sailing at 6:40 a.m. plying between Central and Yung Shue Wan. Ferry services were the only means of transport for the island, and an occupancy rate of more than 90% was indeed too high. Owing to the implementation of free seating on ferries, many parents were worried that they could not sit with their children. Some residents opined that the seats on ferries were not spacious enough. She hoped that TD would study the issues in the mid-term review and give response.
- (b) In view of the ferry service operating during 9:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., she requested TD to explore whether appropriate measures could be introduced to prevent the ferries from almost reaching full occupancy. She also requested TD and the ferry operator to keep a close watch of the frequency of ferry service and the situation of students and residents travelling by ferry.

148. Mr CHAN Lin-wai said that Lamma Island also faced similar problems, and the demand for ferry service in the evening was high. He hoped that Hong Kong and Kowloon Ferry Holdings Limited would consider and explore the proposal of providing additional sailings in the evening.

149. Miss Florence HO indicated that TD had taken note of Members' views.

(Mr KWONG Koon-wan left the meeting at around 6:05 p.m.)

XVI. Question on parking spaces at Discovery Bay (Paper T&TC 23/2019)

150. The Acting Chairman welcomed Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung, District Operations Officer (Lantau) of HKPF; and Ms YUEN Kit-fung, Engineer/Islands 2 of TD to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of Discovery Bay Services Management Limited (DBSML) and Hong Kong Resort Company Limited (HKR) had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

151. Ms Amy YUNG briefly presented the question.

152. Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung responded as follows:

- (a) As Ms Amy YUNG had just indicated, many non-residents entered DB by car which caused a serious problem of illegal parking and might even lead to accidents. In response to illegal parking of a large number of vehicles on private roads, the Police would urge DBSML to ensure safe and smooth traffic.
- (b) He said DBSML was aware that cases of serious road obstruction caused by illegal parking might be immediately reported to the Police for handling at scene. He explained that since the location fell within the private lot under the management of DBSML, the Police could take corresponding action only upon receipt of reports.

(Post-meeting note: According to records, the Police had received two complaints about illegal parking in the first quarter of 2019, and issued four Fixed Penalty Tickets to prosecute against offenders including motorists driving/parking illegally in DB without a permit.)

- (c) If road obstruction had affected vehicular access and DBSML did not react, members of the public might report to the Police for expeditious assistance at scene.

153. Ms YUEN Kit-fung said that as the Police had stated, roads in the area of DB were private properties, therefore, the management and improvements works should be undertaken by DBSML. If DBSML planned to implement measures to improve the traffic condition in DB, TD might give advice on road safety and design.

154. Mr Peter TSANG said that DBSML had given a written reply regarding the entry of outside vehicles into the control area of DB, and had nothing to add for the time being.

155. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She opined that although the written reply given by DBSML and HKR did not completely answer the question, they did not arrange representatives to attend the meeting to give response. She remarked that most of the illegally parked vehicles belonged to HKR, and had taken pictures of illegal parking and passed to DBSML for follow-up. However, the crux of the problem lied in the difficulty of requesting DBSML to exercise self-regulation or monitor another

subsidiary company under the same parent company. The Police had just indicated that if DBSML did not handle the reported cases, the Police might take follow-up action. She therefore hoped that the Police would conduct site inspection for understanding the actual situation of illegal parking in DB.

- (b) At 9:15 a.m. yesterday, she witnessed the speeding of a tractor which overtook a golf cart and bounded for DB Tunnel. She requested the Police to look into the case.
- (c) Many construction vehicles were parked beside the fire hydrant, especially during the lunch hours of workers in the afternoon. She was worried that in the event of a fire or traffic accident, those illegally parked vehicles might obstruct other vehicles from accessing the scene. She requested the Police to take appropriate action such as giving advice to offending drivers or conducting joint inspection with the Fire Services Department to examine the problem of illegal parking beside fire hydrants.
- (d) Given that many motorists used to park their vehicles illegally, illegal parking was common on private land not designated for car park uses. As learnt, if the land use of a site had been changed for more than five years, the concerned developer had to apply to the Town Planning Board for rezoning of the draft outline zoning plan (OZP). Over the years, she had taken many photographs which could prove that the developer engaged in illegal parking without making an application. If the relevant OZP showed that the location concerned was not a car park, the developer had committed the offence of illegal parking by parking vehicles thereat.
- (e) She expressed great discontent with HKR and DBSML again for not arranging representatives to the meeting to give response and for the serious problem of illegal parking in DB. She believed that the residents would be the victims in the end in case an incident occurred. She hoped that Mr Peter TSANG would reflect this to the concerned LegCo Members and follow up on DBSML's mismanagement and the suspected unauthorised land use by the developer.

156. Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung explained that since the concerned place was a private lot, the problem of illegal parking should be followed up by the private company responsible for the management. The Police faced certain restrictions in enforcement action and could take corresponding action only when road traffic was adversely affected by serious road obstruction. However, the Police would be willing to provide assistance if DBSML was aware of the problem of illegal parking but unable to immediately handle it. The Police was also duty bound to take action in case of serious traffic congestion that obstructed the access of residents. If members of the public failed to obtain assistance from DBSML to remove the vehicles causing obstruction, they might report the case to the Police for providing assistance at scene.

157. Mr Peter TSANG undertook to relay Ms Amy YUNG's views to the company.

158. Ms Amy YUNG thanked the Police for giving a positive response. She would also conduct inspection from time to time and send photos to the media, letting the public know the

situation in DB and the problem of improper supervision. She wanted the government departments to know despite DBSML had exercised self-regulation, the problem of illegal parking was partly caused by vehicles of the company, and such situation should be rectified promptly.

XVII. Question on acute shortage of facilities in the new coach station at the Airport
(Paper T&TC 24/2019)

159. The Acting Chairman said that the Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK) was unable to arrange representatives to attend the meeting but had provided a written reply for Members' perusal.

160. Ms Amy YUNG briefly presented the question. She expressed grave dismay and condemned AAHK which, being a statutory body, neither arranged representatives to attend the meeting nor provided the timetable of implementing the measures in the written reply. In the past, a temporary vehicle holding area for parking of vehicles was provided at the Passenger Terminal Building in the airport where the Departure Hall was located, with baggage trolleys for transport of luggage by members of the public/tourists; therefore, many families with children would alight there for access to the terminal building. However, at present, there was no temporary vehicle holding area and baggage trolleys, causing inconvenience to members of the public/tourists accessing to the Departure Hall for undergoing departure formalities. Moreover, she was discontented with AAHK for not consulting the DB residents and the relevant DC on the relocation plan of route no. DB02R bus stop. She asked the Secretariat to write to AAHK requesting it to provide a written reply to her question.

161. The Acting Chairman asked the Secretariat to follow up with AAHK.

(Post-meeting note: The Committee had written to AAHK conveying Members' views and requesting it to provide a written reply.)

XVIII. Question on traffic arrangement in line with the commercial development of Tung Chung Area 6
(Paper T&TC 25/2019)

162. The Acting Chairman welcomed Ms YUEN Kit-fung, Engineer/Islands 2 of TD and Mr AU Hok-lang, Engineer/22 (Lantau) of CEDD to the meeting to respond to the question. The joint written reply of the Planning Department (PlanD) and CEDD had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

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

164. Ms YUEN Kit-fung said that TD had all along been keeping a close watch of the traffic condition on various roads in Tung Chung. Roads in the surrounding area of Tung Chung Area 6 (including Tat Tung Road and Hing Tung Street) were local distributor roads, and their traffic flow was affected by factors including vehicular movement, waiting vehicles, as well as activities on roads. TD could not provide data on traffic flow on the concerned road sections

for the time being, but the daily traffic operation of the roads was observed to be normal. When a development project was to be launched, the Government would in general require the project proponent to conduct a traffic impact assessment (TIA) and propose corresponding mitigation measures. CEDD was conducting the preliminary engineering assessment of the planned commercial development-cum- public market in Tung Chung Area 6. TD would request CEDD to provide assessment based on traffic flow and condition of the concerned road sections in the TIA, in order to ensure that the transport facilities in North Lantau were able to cope with the additional traffic flow arising from the new development project. (Consolidated version)

165. Mr AU Hok-lang said that CEDD was conducting the preliminary TIA for the commercial development at the concerned location and the preliminary findings were anticipated to be available in mid-2019, which might then be used for reference by the relevant departments in taking forward the development project.

166. Mr LEE Ka-ho was disappointed that TD and CEDD did not provide the data on traffic flow of the concerned roads in their responses. IDC had time and again discussed the traffic congestion at the roundabout outside MTR Tung Chung Station Exit A and on Tat Tung Road, but the representative of TD just stated that the daily traffic condition on roads in the surrounding areas of Tung Chung Area 6 was normal. He doubted whether TD's information was reliable. PlanD also pointed out in the written reply that the site in Tung Chung Area 6 in essence had no material difference after rezoning. Nevertheless, he considered government land and commercial land were different from one another. He understood that a commercial building of about 30 storeys (nearly 100 metres in height) would be constructed in Area 6, and the traffic flow at the location would increase drastically after a change in land use. He hoped that CEDD would provide Members with the preliminary findings for reference upon the completion of the preliminary TIA.

167. Mr AU Hok-lang said that various departments were involved in taking forward the development project. After completing the preliminary TIA, CEDD would provide the preliminary findings to those relevant departments taking forward the project for reference, so that Members' requests could be followed up accordingly.

(Ms LEE Kwai-chun left the meeting at around 6:30 p.m.)

XIX. Question on request for provision of bus stop shelters and bus arrival information display panels
(Paper T&TC 27/2019)

168. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss CHOI Siu-man, Sherman, Senior Transport Officer/Islands 1 of TD and Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win to the meeting to respond to the question. The written reply of Long Win had been distributed to Members for perusal before the meeting.

169. Mr LAU Chin-pang briefly presented the question. He added that bus stop shelters were provided at some locations in the bus terminal of Mun Tung Estate only and hoped that the bus company would provide bus stop shelters at the remaining locations. Moreover, as the

bus stop off Ping Yat House would be used as pick-up/drop-off point of bus routes serving Tung Chung West, he proposed that Long Win and TD should provide shelter and bus arrival information display panel (display panel) for the bus stop.

170. Miss Sherman CHOI said that TD had all along been encouraging the bus companies to improve the facilities at bus stops, including provision of shelters and display panels. Nevertheless, the bus companies would consider whether to provide the facilities subject to factors such as availability of resources, passenger demand and actual geographical environment of bus stops. TD would continue to encourage Long Win to proactively consider Members' views where resources and environment permitted.

171. Mr Rayson LAW briefly presented the written reply.

172. Mr Eric KWOK said that the New Lantau Bus Company (1973) Limited (NLB) had previously undertaken to provide shelters for the bus stops on Chung Yan Road off NLTH. As the representative of NLB indicated at a T&TC meeting last year that follow-up action on the proposal would be taken, he enquired about the progress. Moreover, regarding the NLB bus stop near Yung Yat House in Yat Tung Estate for picking up and setting down of passengers of route nos. B6, 38X and so on, the shelter of bus stop had been removed earlier and he hoped NLB would install a new one there. He was very disappointed because there was no progress regarding the provision of display panels at the bus terminal in Yat Tung Estate so far.

173. Mr LAU Chin-pang hoped that TD and Long Win would proactively consider Members' proposals and strive to improve the facilities and environment of bus stops.

174. Mr Holden CHOW recommended provision of shelters and display panels at the bus stops in Ying Tung Estate to meet residents' aspirations.

175. Mr WONG Wah stated that regarding the views on provision of shelters for the bus stops on Chung Yan Road off NLTH, as far as he knew, the two bus stops on Chung Yan Road were provided with shelters by other companies. NLB would arrange staff to conduct site inspection to understand the actual situation.

176. Mr Rayson LAW said that regarding the proposal of providing display panels in the bus terminal of Yat Tung Estate, as he understood, Long Win had already provided display panels outside the bus regulators' office in the bus terminal which showed the departure time of the next departure of various bus routes originating at the mentioned terminus. Long Win would continue to provide the service.

XX. Question on the new bus terminal at Citygate
(Paper T&TC 28/2019)

177. The Acting Chairman welcomed Miss CHOI Siu-man, Sherman, Senior Transport Officer/Islands 1 of TD to the meeting to respond to the question.

178. Mr LAU Chin-pang briefly presented the question. He added that regarding the information provided by TD earlier, he proposed to relocate the drop-off point of NLB route

nos. 39M and B6, which departed for Mun Tung Estate, to location no. 9, that is, the rear of the existing pick-up/drop-off point of NLB route no. 38. He explained that if the bus stops of bus routes plying to Tung Chung West were provided at the same location, Mun Tung Estate residents who failed to take route no. 39M might change to travel by route no. 38 for Yat Tung Estate and then walk to Mun Tung Estate. He also considered that the above arrangement would help rationalise bus routes serving Tung Chung North, and hoped that TD could provide the commissioning date of the new bus terminal at Citygate.

179. Miss Sherman CHOI said that under the lead of IsDO and CEDD, various government departments concerned were proactively striving for completion of acceptance inspection for the new bus terminus in the first quarter of 2019. Upon confirmation of the commissioning date, TD would inform Members as appropriate. Moreover, TD had consulted Members earlier on the arrangement of franchised bus service at various bus termini in Tung Chung town centre. Regarding Mr LAU Chin-pang's proposal of relocating the pick-up point of route nos. 39M and B6 to the rear of the drop-off point of NLB route no. 38, it would reduce the number of proposed bus drop-off points to be shared among bus routes from four to three, thereby adversely affecting the daily operation of the bus terminus. From the perspective of operational needs, TD considered it necessary to retain the four drop-off points near the entrance. Besides, as the proposed pick-up point of route no. 39M was near the escalator with limited space, it was not desirable for passengers to queue up there. For these reasons, TD believed that its arrangement proposed earlier would be more appropriate to cater for operational needs. TD noted the related views and would closely monitor the operation of the new bus terminus upon its commissioning and, where possible, discuss with the bus company suitable arrangements.

180. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He suggested that TD should arrange a site inspection for Members. The pedestrian flow and bus routes of the new bus terminal, with its exit at Tat Tung Road, would be increasing. Moreover, the exit/entrance of the bus stop at Tung Chung Skyrail Terminal was located at Tat Tung Road near Tung Chung Swimming Pool, which was also the location of the temporary bus terminal of NLB. He doubted whether TD had seriously considered the loading of vehicular traffic on Tat Tung Road when assessing the traffic flow.
- (b) After One Citygate was linked up with Two Citygate, residents had to pass through the passage between the two phases of the residential development and then cross the carriageway to go to the bus stops of NLB route nos. 39M and B6. In view of the continuous vehicular and pedestrian flow as well as the large number of bus stops, he asked what arrangements the Administration would make.
- (c) He was concerned about the location and arrangement of the ventilation opening in the new bus terminal. In view of the busy vehicular flow inside the bus terminal, he enquired whether TD would explore solutions to the emission problem in consultation with EPD or by applying its professional knowledge.

- (d) It should be feasible to relocate the bus stop of NLB route no. B6 to the vicinity of the existing temporary bus stop. However, he enquired whether TD had negotiated with the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) on connecting the area to Tat Tung Road Garden situating at the rear of the bus stop, so as to avoid overcrowding of passengers and tourists queueing at the bus stop for buses during public holidays. He hoped that after the implementation of the route no. B6 bus stop at HZMB Hong Kong Port, TD would study with LCSD the queueing arrangement for waiting passengers.

181. Mr Holden CHOW expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Many residents in Tung Chung were concerned about the commissioning date of the new bus terminal. As far as he knew, apart from pick-up/drop-off points for public buses, spaces were also reserved in the new bus terminal for non-franchised buses. Seeing that the shuttle buses of Century Link and The Visionary were parked on Fu Tung Street at present, he proposed that the pick-up/drop-off points of the shuttle buses be relocated to the new bus terminal.
- (b) He expected that many problems would be solved after the commissioning of a large bus terminal. As a larger space was now available, he proposed to relocate some "E" route bus stops to other places, thereby diverting the traffic of the bus routes using the bus stop off Tung Chung Swimming Pool and improving the situation of pick-up/drop-off at the bus stop. As there would be many buses picking up/dropping off passengers at the location concerned which was very limited in space, he hoped that traffic diversion and other appropriate adjustments could be made through the construction of new bus terminal.

182. Mr YIP Pui-kei expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Since space had been reserved for pick-up/drop-off points of non-franchised buses, TD should consider relocating the bus stops of shuttle buses of Century Link and The Visionary, etc. to the new bus terminal.
- (b) He understood that arrangement had been made to separate the pick-up/drop-off points of Citybus route no. S56 or S52A and NLB route no. 37M or 37. However, these bus routes all routed via Tung Chung North, and residents who opted for route no. 37M would not be able to know the arrival of route no. S56 under the new arrangement. He suggested that TD should consider arranging the buses plying to Tung Chung North to pick up/drop off passengers at the same location, and it was believed that this would be welcomed by the bus operators and residents.
- (c) As residents needed to cross the road to go to the bus stops at present, he hoped that TD would, after the meeting, not only consider providing at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities but also explore installing escalators connecting to Two Citygate, facilitating residents to access to the bus stops via the shopping centre. As learnt, residents might access to the shopping centre with elevators, but he had no idea of the number of escalators and the mode of operation, that

is, operating upwards or downwards only, or operating in both directions. He requested TD to provide more information.

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

- (a) According to the bus company's written reply, power supply had to be considered in installation of display panels. He enquired whether display panels were installed in the new bus terminal.
- (b) He enquired whether sufficient staff common rooms would be provided in the new bus terminal for bus drivers to take rest.
- (c) Regarding the parking of non-franchised buses, he enquired whether arrangement was made for the parking of specified kind of franchised buses therein.
- (d) He asked about the use of the exit/entrance at Mei Tung Street in the future.

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

- (a) Regarding Members' concern over the arrangements, traffic condition, pedestrian crossing facilities, etc. after the commissioning of the new bus terminus, TD might, without causing obstruction to the inspection and acceptance procedure, make arrangement with the developer for site inspection by Members to facilitate their better understanding of the arrangements.
- (b) Regarding the issue of air pollution, the land sale conditions had required the developer to submit to EPD reports of air quality testing. She believed that the department concerned would take follow-up action.
- (c) Regarding the arrangement for buses serving Tung Chung North to pick up/drop off passengers at the same location, TD had tried its best to provide pick-up points of routes of similar routings, such as route nos. 37 and 37M plying to Ying Tung Estate, at close locations to meet resident demand as far as possible when it formulated the proposals. Nevertheless, owing to the limited space for pick-up and queueing of passengers inside the bus terminus, it was indeed difficult to arrange many routes to call at one stop. TD suggested that residents might check the bus arrival time provided by the bus companies beforehand to decide the bus route to take.
- (d) On the arrangement of pick-up/drop-off points for non-franchised buses, TD was conducting a comprehensive review of the facilities for non-franchised buses, and would examine the service of non-franchised buses for areas around Tung Chung, such as the arrangement of pick-up/drop-off points for resident and employee bus services. TD would inform the relevant stakeholders of the arrangement as appropriate.

185. Mr Eric KWOK said that according to the current design of the exit/entrance of the new bus terminal and the temporary bus terminal in Tung Chung, departing buses would turn right and enter Tat Tung Road, that is, one-way traffic. In the past, the traffic could be diverted to Mei Tung Street, for example, buses operating route no. 38 or other bus routes plying to Mun Tung Estate passed Mei Tung Street, but now all buses turned right after leaving the bus terminal. He asked whether TD had conducted computer-simulated tests to solve the problem of “bottleneck” caused by a large number of vehicles in peak hours.

186. Miss Sherman CHOI said that regarding Mr Eric KWOK’s enquiry on the exit/entrance of the bus terminus, one-way traffic was implemented for Tat Tung Road at the end of Mei Tung Street. As a south bound lane towards Mei Tung Street would be available at the exit/entrance of the new bus terminus, franchised or non-franchised bus might then choose to turn left or turn right after coming out from the bus terminus. At present, buses making a left turn on Mei Tung Street might still turn left at the exit/entrance on Tat Tung Road and bound for Shun Tung Road. Members might pay attention to the arrangement at the junctions during site inspection.

XXI. Question on Discovery Bay Bus route no. DB01R
(Paper T&TC 29/2019)

187. The Acting Chairman welcomed Mr Peter TSANG, Senior Manager-Transportation of DBTSL to the meeting to respond to the question.

188. Ms Sammi FU briefly presented the question.

189. Mr Peter TSANG made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) DBTSL had always arranged the service frequency and type of vehicle of route no. DB01R according to the service needs of residents. Recently, DBTSL conducted a review of the demand and supply of the service of route no. DB01R, the findings of which indicated that the frequency of route no. DB01R could meet the passenger demand under normal circumstances. During the peak hours between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 a.m. on weekdays, the bus service was operated at a 10-minute interval, and at a 12-minute interval during the next hour. Double-decker buses were mainly deployed to carry passengers during these two hours. Most of the passengers travelled to DB for work and school. He said that as there were not many double-decker buses operating under DBTSL’s fleet, single-decker buses sometimes had to be allocated to provide service in peak hours in the case of breakdown of double-decker buses, making the occupancy rate higher. The double-decker buses were in normal operation in recent time, and the bus service should be adequate to meet the resident demand.
- (b) DBTSL also noted the ascending trend of transport demand of people going to DB for work and school. To enhance the service level, DBTSL planned to increase the number of double-decker buses, and would negotiate with and submit the application of procuring double-decker buses to TD in due course. To effectively use the roads and DBTSL’s operating resources, DBTSL would

consider replacing single-decker buses with double-decker buses to operate the bus routes with high patronage.

190. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She said that she had repeatedly made it clear at T&TC meetings that DB buses were Residents Service (RS). Regarding the mode of operation, when the bus operator applied for a passenger service licence from TD, it was required to submit together the service contract signed with the users or organisations, completed application form and other documents, with the bus types and service frequency stated in the form, for TD's approval. Estate bus service was also available for Caribbean Coast, and the terms of which stipulated that non-residents were not eligible to take the buses. This was the difference between estate bus and franchised bus service. The contract of the bus service of DB was signed between DBTSL and the management office on behalf of the DB owners' corporation (OC) and residents after negotiation. DBTSL had to consult the OC if the mode of operation of the route was to be amended.
- (b) She understood that only a small number of DB residents took bus route no. DB01R plying from Tung Chung to DB in peak hours. DB was a private area, and all vehicles entering DB were subject to the payment of tunnel toll. As to the charges on road maintenance, cleansing and security services, they were covered by the management fee paid by DB residents. Since DB bus service was RS, she thought that residents from other districts should not be accorded with priority for using the service, and that the number of double-decker buses and service frequency should not be increased hastily due to passenger demand arising from non-residents because the required expense for procurement of a double-decker bus and licence application was high.
- (c) As she thought, students going to school in DB and their parents might request the school to apply to the departments concerned for additional school bus licence to provide enhanced school bus service for students.
- (d) Although she had time and again raised questions on RS in DB for discussion at meetings, it was a matter of regret that Ms Sammi FU failed to clarify the details when raising this question.

191. Ms Sammi FU said she understood that route no. DB01R mainly served DB residents, but the bus route was open for use by other members of the public. Owing to the patronage restriction imposed on school buses or nanny vans provided by the schools, many students travelling from Tung Chung to DB for school could only take bus route no. DB01R. To avoid being late for school, students had to squeeze into the crowded bus compartment in peak hours. In view of this, she proposed that the frequency be increased in peak hours to meet the demand of students for bus service of route no. DB01R.

192. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) As Mr Peter TSANG had pointed out just now, service of the bus route could meet the passenger demand at present. She reiterated that local residents should be accorded priority to RS. Students going to school in DB might travel by school bus. In case of inadequate school bus places, the school should apply to the department concerned for additional school bus licence. Passengers from other districts did not need to pay the charges on road maintenance, cleansing and security services in DB, so the procurement of additional double-decker buses should not be sponsored by DB residents to serve people from other districts.
- (b) Schools in DB were located at DB Central and there was a construction site at DB North, if route no. DB01R was operated with a larger number of double-decker buses and higher frequency for the entire routing, it would only lead to an increased vehicular flow and traffic load on Discovery Bay Road. She therefore proposed that students and their parents should request the schools to increase the number of school buses.

193. Mr Peter TSANG responded as follows:

- (a) Many people residing in other districts needed to go to work and school in DB, so it was necessary for them to use the transport services in DB (such as ferries or buses) for accessing to and from DB. Although the licence of DB bus service was named as RS, non-residents were also allowed to use the service.
- (b) If RS was exclusively used by residents, commuters and students from other districts would be forced to enter and leave DB by other vehicles, thus causing an increased traffic flow on Discovery Bay Road. According to observations, the usage of DB buses demonstrated an ascending trend. While most passengers taking the trips from Tung Chung to DB in morning peak hours were people working and attending schools in DB, most passengers taking the trips from DB to Tung Chung or Sunny Bay were DB residents. For this reason, DBTSL operated these routes with double-decker buses to mitigate the traffic load on roads and the pressure on service frequency.
- (c) He said that the main difficulty encountered by the trade was recruitment of bus drivers. Even if DBTSL was willing to enhance frequency, it was difficult to recruit additional staff. Deployment of additional double-decker buses was a win-win proposal because it helped make better use of roads and human resources.

194. The Acting Chairman agreed with Ms Amy YUNG's proposal that students and their parents might request the schools to apply for additional licence for school bus. Having said that, students who attended schools in DB might be treated as part of the DB community, so there were grey areas in whether students could take the RS.

195. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) According to Mr Peter TSANG, it seemed that DBTSL intended to extend the operation of RS to franchised bus service. As a regulator, TD should liaise with DBTSL for understanding the situation. She was concerned that the operator would increase bus frequencies to meet the growth in occupancy rate for profit-making purpose, resulting in traffic overload on roads in DB.
- (b) She disagreed with the Acting Chairman and remarked that students attending schools in DB and their parents were not residing in DB and thus could not be treated as DB residents. She did not disregard the fact that some residents in other districts went to schools in DB, and therefore had suggested increasing the number of school buses or nanny vans. Parents accompanying their children to school in DB might also take the school bus or nanny van with them for direct access to the school without causing negative impact on the traffic flow on roads in DB.
- (c) As Mr Peter TSANG had just pointed out that in morning peak hours, residents in DB usually travelled to Tung Chung and Sunny Bay by DB buses and only a small number of residents returned DB from Tung Chung. Many residents reflected that they experienced difficulties in taking DB buses which were often fully packed with construction workers.
- (d) She urged DBTSL to arrange shuttle bus service for construction workers working in DB. Moreover, she mentioned at the last meeting about the confusion and unpleasant incident caused by Mainland visitors travelling on DB bus with luggage. She requested DBTSL again to arrange shuttle bus service to pick up guests of Auberge Discovery Bay Hong Kong to avoid communication problem and confusion involving hotel guests due to travelling on DB buses and language barrier. She reiterated that the target passengers of RS were DB residents, and the operator was required to negotiate with the OC for any changes of the mode of operation.
- (e) She suggested that in organising any large-scale festive activity, DBTSL should arrange coaches to carry participants to the venue of activity. Participants should not travel by DB buses because it would cause inconvenience to DB residents in using the service. She was perplexed that Member who was not representing the concerned constituency raised a question on RS of DB at the T&TC meeting without clarifying the details involved. She considered that Members should be conscientious and well-prepared, and should collect relevant information before raising an item for discussion to avoid improper questions.

196. Ms YU Lai-fan opined that any Member of IDC, whether representing DB or not, might raise questions at the meeting in response to residents' opinions received, aiming to solve the problem for members of the public. Moreover, the Standing Orders did not stipulate that Members should not be concerned over the issues of other constituencies and put forward them for discussion. If DB buses only provided service to DB residents, DBTSL should clearly state that DB buses were restricted to DB residents only, and that residents from other districts were prohibited from using the service.

197. Mr Holden CHOW disagreed with Ms Amy YUNG's viewpoint on another Member. He held that DC members should respect their own identity. Members using improper wording against another Member at the meeting might offend the Member concerned and even tarnish the image of DC.

198. Ms Amy YUNG expressed her views as follows:

- (a) She said that she had no intent to offend other Members. However, she referred to the question which stated "many members of the public had reflected to me", and indicated that the term "members of the public" meant all people in Hong Kong, whereas RS of DB was not open to all people in Hong Kong. If Mr Holden CHOW considered what she had said would make other Members feel embarrassed, she was willing to withdraw her remarks.
- (b) She remarked that the mode of operation of RS had been discussed time and again at T&TC meetings. However, during various events organised by the developer of DB, DB residents experienced difficulties in taking DB buses because many people came from other districts to DB. She did not object to members of the public visiting DB. In fact, she had proposed at an OC meeting a two-tier RS fare system, suggesting a fare of \$4 odd for residents and \$5 odd for non-residents with priority of using RS be given to the residents.
- (c) In her opinion, the most effective way of solving the problem of inadequate trips of DB bus route no. DB01R was to increase the number of school buses or nanny vans. She also urged DBTSL to arrange for other vehicles to carry people working in DB in order to alleviate the traffic congestions on roads in DB.
- (d) She added that operators might, according to their scopes of service provision, apply to TD for service licences to operate non-franchised bus services, and different types of application forms might be used for hotel service, RS and student service, etc.

199. The Acting Chairman remarked that Ms Sammi FU's question aimed to reflect the opinion of the parents of students.

200. Ms Amy YUNG believed that it would not be difficult to apply for a school bus licence, and students travelling with school buses would be exposed to lower risk. She therefore proposed that Ms Sammi FU should request the schools to increase the number of school buses.

201. Ms YU Lai-fan requested DBTSL to provide a written reply to Ms Sammi FU in respect of the question.

202. Mr Peter TSANG said that a written reply would be provided.

XXII. Question on traffic accidents on Tung Chung Road
(Paper T&TC 33/2019)

203. The Acting Chairman welcomed Ms YUEN Kit-fung, Engineer/Islands 2 of TD to the meeting to respond to the question.

204. Mr FAN Chi-ping briefly presented the question. He requested that a speed limit of 30 km/h be imposed on the Tung Chung Road section from the petrol filling station to the roundabout at Shek Mun Kap, fixed speed enforcement cameras (SECs) be installed at the Tung Chung Road section from Wong Ka Wai to Lung Tseng Tau, and a zebra-crossing be provided at the Tung Chung Road junction heading for Shek Lau Po. He requested TD to conduct site inspection on Tung Chung Road as soon as possible and provide a written reply regarding his proposals.

205. Ms YUEN Kit-fung responded as follows:

- (a) According to TD's record, the Tung Chung Road section between Chung Yan Road and Shek Mun Kap was not a traffic accident black spot. According to preliminary information, a traffic accident involving an out-of-control vehicle occurred this February, and TD would follow up on the case after the Police had completed the investigation regarding the accident.
- (b) Regarding the request for installing fixed SECs, TD and the Police would continue to closely monitor the situation of speeding and related traffic accidents, and install SECs as appropriate according to established criteria and subject to the availability of resources. TD had earlier relayed the proposal of installing SECs at the concerned sections of Tung Chung Road to the responsible section, which would consider the arrangement for Tung Chung Road and other locations.
- (c) On the request for installing reduce speed signs, TD had conducted site inspection at Tung Chung Road earlier and installed traffic signs such as "Slow", "Reduce speed now" and "Pedestrians on or crossing road ahead" at appropriate locations. TD welcomed Members to propose locations for installing warning signs and would carefully examine whether the proposed locations were appropriate.
- (d) TD had liaised with the Police earlier and learnt that the Police would step up enforcement action to ensure the safety of road users.

206. Mr FAN Chi-ping expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He had brought up the problems of Tung Chung Road at a meeting years ago. Representatives of TD conducted site inspection and undertook to take follow-up action then, but the problems had not been solved so far.
- (b) In the past, villagers could directly access to Yu Tung Road via the road at the entrance of Shek Lau Po. However, to tie in with the project of Mun Tung Estate, the passage at Shek Lau Po was closed by TD and vehicles bounding for Yu Tung Road had to detour via Tung Chung Road. Despite TD had undertaken at that time to reopen the road section at Shek Lau Po upon completion of the project, it ended up with nothing. Given that Tung Chung

Road was very narrow and vehicles from Mui Wo to Shek Mun Kap were always travelling at high speed, serious threats were posed to villagers (especially the elderly persons). He requested TD to install traffic lights, provide a zebra-crossing and implement other speed limit measures at Wong Ka Wai and Lung Tseng Tau near the entrance of Shek Lau Po Village.

207. Mr Randy YU expressed his views as follows:

- (a) On 23 February this year, a traffic accident involving collision between a taxi and a goods vehicle occurred at Wong Ka Wai and Lung Tseng Tau near the entrance of Shek Lau Po Village, with seven persons injured. The accident aroused concern of the villagers about pedestrian safety, especially that of the elderly persons. The footbridge near Yat Tung Estate had been included in the “Universal Accessibility” Programme earlier with priority in retrofitting lifts, because many elderly persons went to the restaurant in Yat Tung Estate via the location concerned, hence a strong demand for crossing facilities.
- (b) In response to the traffic accident occurred earlier in Pui O, TD had tightened the speed limit at the concerned road section to 30 km/h. Given the potential safety hazards at various road sections in Tai O, Shui Hau, Tong Fuk, the old village at Tung Chung Road and Mui Wo, he requested TD to tighten the speed limit at these road sections to 30 km/h as well. He shared the same view with Mr FAN Chi-ping who repeatedly indicated that motorists would not mind a slightly longer journey time to safeguard road safety within the rural area.
- (c) The representative of TD had just stated that Wong Ka Wai and Lung Tseng Tau near the entrance of Shek Lau Po Village was not a traffic black spot, with an average of one serious traffic accident annually in recent years. For example, a heavy goods vehicle overturned at the location on 15 December 2016; a white private car lost control and crashed into a lamp post on 30 September 2017; and a traffic accident occurred on 23 February this year causing injury to seven persons. He requested TD to impose speed limit and provide additional road safety facilities at the location in an expeditious manner to safeguard the safety of villagers. He believed that the villagers would not care about the minor impact on vehicular flow caused by the above measures.

208. Mr LAU Chin-pang agreed with the proposal of enhancing the road safety measures, and requested TD to review the contingency arrangement to be taken after the occurrence of traffic accidents. He and various Members had pointed out at the meeting that in case an accident occurred on Tung Chung Road and road closure was required, there would be no way out for the vehicles. He therefore proposed that Tung Chung Road be extended to the road at Mun Tung Estate, so that vehicles might travel to the town centre via Chung Yat Street and Yu Tung Road when traffic queues occurred on Tung Chung Road. He asked whether TD had followed up on the proposal and formulated the works schedule.

209. Mr Eric KWOK expressed his views as follows:

- (a) He agreed with Mr FAN Chi-ping's proposal for improvements of Tung Chung Road. TD cited previous data a while ago to prove that the concerned road section was not a traffic black spot. In fact, as he had pointed out last year, with the occupation of Mun Tung Estate and the pedestrian flow generated from Joysmark and the two secondary schools nearby, the traffic in the vicinity of Joysmark and the market was very busy. Vehicles operating from Tung Chung to the town centre always passed through various junctions and bus stops at high speed, which included Shek Mun Kap and two bends on the down ramp, the exit of Shek Lau Po and bus stop at the front after passing the road bend, two ingress/egress points for Wong Ka Wai, the vehicular ingress/egress point of Joysmark, as well as three ingress/egress points for Ha Ling Pei, etc., with many dangers lurking throughout the journey.
- (b) He suggested that TD should implement short-, medium- and long-term measures respectively. On short-term measures, he requested TD to install traffic signs such as "speed limit ahead", "children and villagers ahead" and "speed limit at 30 km/h ahead" at appropriate locations. On medium-term measures, he proposed that SECs be installed at appropriate locations. On long-term measures, he recommended expeditious provision of an access connecting the two secondary schools with Mun Tung Estate.

210. Mr CHOW Yuk-tong said that the road section where the traffic accidents took place could pose potential hazards of safety, and suggested that TD should conduct site inspection, look into the cause of traffic accidents and draw up improvement measures to prevent recurrence of traffic accidents. He believed that it was not difficult to implement the proposed measures and hoped that TD would introduce the remedies early to alleviate the concern of the villagers.

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

- (a) TD had been very concerned about the traffic condition on Tung Chung Road. Traffic signs such as "Slow" and "Reduce speed now" had been installed at appropriate locations in the past. She reiterated that TD welcomed Members to propose locations for installing warning signs.
- (b) Regarding the proposal of providing pedestrian crossing facilities, TD considered it inappropriate to provide such facilities at certain locations after examining the concerned road sections and considering the comments of the relevant village representatives. Nevertheless, it would continue to explore the feasibility and necessity of providing pedestrian crossings at other relevant road sections, and discuss with Members the arrangement of site inspection after the meeting.

212. Mr WONG Fuk-kan expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Tung Chung Road was a perilous road, and the road at the entrance of Shek Lau Po Village was improperly designed. When he drove into the lane of Shek Lau Po from Wong Ka Wai, his car grazed the lamp posts three times. Traffic

accidents involving vehicles crashing into lamp posts at the location had occurred several times. Members and the relevant rural committee had time and again reflected the problem, but HyD had not implemented any improvement measures so far.

- (b) A number of traffic accidents had occurred at the entrance of Shek Lau Po Village which included the case of a tractor towing heavy machinery that lost balance and overturned at the location. In February this year, a goods vehicle lost control, dashed to the opposite lane and collided with an oncoming taxi, and the injured person remained unconscious even now. He proposed that HyD should conduct a trial run at the road section in Shek Lau Po to examine whether the vehicle would easily lose control at the bend and dash to the opposite lane.
- (c) Although the representative of TD just mentioned that pedestrian crossing would be provided at the above location, he was worried that it would end up with nothing again just like years ago, when he pointed out that traffic accidents would easily occur at the bend on the road section at Shek Mun Kap, TD conducted various site inspections to South Lantau but no improvement measures had been implemented up to now. Mr Randy YU had requested in writing for implementing anti-skid road surfacing at the concerned location, but TD did not take any follow-up action. At present, some double-decker buses routed through the road section at Wong Ka Wai. It would be dangerous when double-decker buses passed the bend because the road was narrow. He suggested that HyD should carry out trial run of double-decker buses at the road section of Wong Ka Wai, and promptly draw up corresponding improvement measures to prevent recurrence of traffic accident at the location.

213. Mr Holden CHOW proposed that the improvements works for Tung Chung Road be included in the checklist of follow-up items for the Committee to follow up on the progress of the project.

214. The Acting Chairman said that Tung Chung Road was full of potential hazards and urged TD to face up to and promptly tackle the problems.

215. Ms YUEN Kit-fung said that TD had previously received a proposal of providing a bus bay on Tung Chung Road. The preliminary design of the bus bay was generally completed and TD would seek views from the relevant stakeholders at the next step. TD would arrange a joint site inspection with Members in due course to discuss the arrangements for providing additional facilities such as pedestrian crossing.

216. Mr WONG Wah said that as he understood, Mr WONG Fuk-kan just meant that the curvature of the bend on Tung Chung Road was inadequate so that when a vehicle rounded the bend swiftly, the vehicle body would slightly tilt outward. If the bend was curved, it would be easier for the vehicle to maintain balance. He therefore suggested that the design of the bend should be improved.

217. Mr Randy YU proposed that site inspection and discussion on the arrangement for the improvements proposals be conducted expeditiously in March this year.

218. The Acting Chairman proposed that with reference to the speed limit imposed on roads on South Lantau, the speed limit on Tung Chung Road be reduced to 30 km/h and SECs be installed there to combat speeding.

219. Ms YUEN Kit-fung said that TD had to further study the appropriateness of the proposal.

220. Mr FAN Chi-ping hoped that TD would promptly follow up on Members' proposals and conduct site inspection with the rural committee within two weeks for discussing the arrangement for the proposed improvements.

221. Ms YUEN Kit-fung said that TD would promptly arrange a site inspection after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: A joint site inspection was conducted on 4 April 2019 by Mr Randy YU, Mr Eric KWOK, Ms WONG Chau-ping and Mr LAU Chin-pang with TD, HKPF, HyD and the Housing Department. Members' proposals concerning the road safety on Tung Chung Road were under review by the departments concerned.)

(Ms Josephine TSANG left the meeting at around 7:20 p.m. and Mr LAU Chin-pang left the meeting at around 7:45 p.m.)

XXIII. Any Other Business

Highways Department's Minor Traffic Improvement Projects and Works Schedules

222. The Acting Chairman welcomed Mr WAN Chi-kin, District Engineer/Islands of HyD to the meeting to respond to enquiries. HyD had submitted before the meeting the Islands District Minor Traffic Improvement Projects and Works Schedules as at early March this year. The paper was tabled at the meeting and Members were invited to raise questions and opinions.

223. Mr WONG Fuk-kan commended HyD for the grass cutting work at the road section at Pui O Au, and indicated that the line of vision of the drivers of double-decker buses was no longer obstructed by the weeds after cutting.

224. Members noted the report.

XXIV. Date of next meeting

225. The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 2:00 p.m. on 20 May 2019 (Monday).

-END-