

**The 1st Special Meeting of
the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) of
the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC)**

Date: 19 February 2021 (Friday)
Time: 10:30 a.m.
Venue: Conference Room, Kowloon City District Office,
7/F, Kowloon City Government Offices,
42 Bailey Street, Kowloon

Present:

Chairman: Mr LEE Hin-long
Vice-chairman: Mr FUNG Man-tao, Joshua
Members: Mr WONG Wing-kit
Mr LAI Kwong-wai (Arrived at 10:44 a.m.)
Miss CHAU Hei-man
Mr PUN Kwok-wah, JP (Arrived at 10:40 a.m.)
(Left at 11:48 a.m.)
Mr KWOK Tin-lap
Mr YUM Kwok-tung, Pius
Miss MAK Sui-ki, Jakki
Mr WONG Kwok-tung, Daniel
Mr TSANG Kin-chiu
Mr YEUNG Chun-yu
The Hon LEE Wai-king, Starry, SBS, (Arrived at 10:40 a.m.)
JP (Left at 11:34 a.m.)
Dr KWAN Ka-lun (Left at 11:53 a.m.)
Mr MA Hei-pang (Left at 11:44 a.m.)
Mr CHO Wui-hung, MH (Arrived at 10:40 a.m.)
(Left at 11:25 a.m.)
Mr CHEUNG King-fan (Arrived at 10:40 a.m.)
(Left at 11:34 a.m.)
Mr YANG Wing-kit (Arrived at 10:40 a.m.)
(Left at 11:25 a.m.)
Dr KWONG Po-yin (Arrived at 10:40 a.m.)

Absent:

Ms LEUNG Yuen-ting
Mr LAM Tak-shing
Mr SIU Leong-sing

Mr HE Huahan
 Mr NG Po-keung, MH
 Mr HO Hin-ming, BBS, MH

Secretary: Miss LEE Cheuk-yan,
 Charmaine
 Executive Officer (District
 Council) 1, Kowloon City
 District Office

In Attendance: Ms LAU Sau-man, Betty
 Senior Executive Officer
 (District Council), Kowloon
 City District Office

Attendance by Invitation:

Item 1	Mr Ben HON	Public Transport Research Team
	Mr MAN Leung-chin	Meinhardt Infrastructure And Environment Limited
	Mr Clive LAW	Lok Fung (HK) Limited
	Ms Crystal LEE	Lok Fung (HK) Limited
	Mr Kenneth WONG	Lok Fung (HK) Limited
	Mr Nelson TANG	Skywalk Consultants Limited
	Dr LEE Shu-kam	Business, Economic and Public Policy Research Centre, Hong Kong Shue Yan University
	Ms WONG Ka-man, Carmen	Business, Economic and Public Policy Research Centre, Hong Kong Shue Yan University
	Mr Tinson LEUNG	Ho Wang SPB Limited
	Mr SOH Chun-wah, Wallace	Ho Wang SPB Limited

* * *

The Chairman of the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) welcomed Members, representatives of government departments and organisations to the meeting. The **Chairman** then reminded Members to declare interests in accordance with the Standing Orders. He also said that if and when the number of Members present at the meeting was less than 13, he would adjourn the meeting according to the Standing Orders. Lastly, he reminded attendees to turn off the ringers on their mobile phones or switch them to vibration mode, and remain silent during the meeting.

2. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** raised a question about the rules of meetings and queried the failure by the Chairman to follow the practice of other committees by

circulating papers instead of convening a special meeting to handle the funding applications. According to the instructions of the Chairman, the Secretary, in response, said that a total of six proposals were received in respect of the present funding applications. As the proposals were in great details, **the Chairman** thus decided to convene this special meeting and invited relevant organisations to answer the enquiries raised by Members.

3. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** raised the issue of rules of meetings again, stating that the date of the next regular TTC meeting would be 4 March 2021. Though **the Secretary** said in view that the proposal contained great details and the convention of a special meeting would allow representatives of relevant organisations to answer the enquiries raised by Members face-to-face, he opined that the papers circulated by other committees were also in great details and there was no difference between the two. He stated he did not quite understand the practice in convening this special meeting by the Chairman and opined that the Chairman's act of convening a special meeting had turned KCDC into a "teller machine".

4. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** pointed out that the convention of a special meeting generally aimed at addressing urgent and unexpected matters instead of handling individual funding applications. In addition, he enquired whether the funding applications were made in compliance with Section 61(a) and (b) of the District Councils Ordinance and the Manual on the Use of District Council Funds revised in 2020 by the Home Affairs Department (HAD) which prescribed the coverage of the district council funds. He also requested the Secretariat to explain the grounds for making the decision on discussing and considering the agenda item and which ordinance it would comply. In case the practice did not comply with the relevant ordinance or was disputable, it was not appropriate to make a decision on the funding applications at the present meeting.

5. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** opined that there was an urgent need for the conduct of the Study on Public Transport Demand in Kowloon City District. As the future commissioning of Tuen Ma Line Phase 2 would lead to a greater demand for supporting transport facilities in its peripheral areas, relevant data were needed for assessment. In addition, it was suggested by the District Office (DO) that under the pandemic, all meetings should not exceed two hours. In view of the previous longer sessions of TTC meetings and time was needed for considering six funding applications, a special meeting should be conducted to provide adequate time for Members to have a better understanding of the details to fulfil their duty. A study on

transport demand was previously conducted by Tai Po District Council and the information obtained would facilitate future discussions on the provision of new routes by bus companies or transport operators and she thus supported the Study.

6. **The Chairman** stated that whether the relevant study complied with Section 61(a) of the District Councils Ordinance was not related to the issue of rules of meetings and he reiterated that the issue of rules was related to the procedures of the meeting. Thus he instructed **the Secretary** that there was no need to respond to the issue at the current stage. He also said that **the Secretary** would state whether the relevant study would comply with the Standing Orders and the manual on funding when she introduced the Paper later. As a result of the pandemic, some meetings of the District Council had to be postponed or cancelled and the relevant agenda item intended for discussion at the last meeting should be handled at the current meeting according to the Standing Orders. However, he estimated that briefing on the Q&A session by means of long distance video would involve longer duration while the conduct of meeting in an informal way was impossible. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** also mentioned at the same time that relevant transport demand study was a matter of urgency for the Committee because of the full commissioning of Tuen Ma Line Phase 2 within this year and it was also beneficial to the future bus route development programme and the work of the Committee. Therefore, after discussion with **the Secretary**, he decided to convene this special meeting.

7. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** stated that **the Chairman** did not respond to his enquiry. He also queried about the practice of **the Chairman** to conduct a meeting while other committees handled the matter by circulation of paper. He also reiterated that he was not opposed to what was mentioned by **Dr KWONG Po-yin** that there was an urgent need for a transport study in the District and opined that like other committees, the matter could be handled by circulation of paper.

8. **The Chairman** gave the first warning to **Mr YANG Wing-kit** and stated that the right to speak by **the Secretary** was not decided by **Mr YANG Wing-kit**.

9. **Mr Pius YUM** stated that the relevant proposal contained more than 50 pages and it was believed that Members present would raise many enquiries on the traffic problems in Kowloon City District. If they were handled by circulation of paper, Members could basically only choose to agree, object or have no comments and thus he was opposed to discussion by circulation. Besides, he pointed out that **the Chairman** had the right to choose whether to make a decision by circulation of

paper. He did not agree to all the issues handled by way of circulation previously and had reflected to some of the committees and the DC chairman that the way of circulation should not be adopted. In addition, it was proposed by DO at present that only two meetings should be convened in a week and each meeting should not last for more than two hours. It was still unknown whether a meeting could be convened on 4 March 2021 and the number of meetings convened this week did not exceed the limit. As such he was of the view that it was not inappropriate on the part of the **Chairman** to convene the present meeting.

10. **The Chairman** stated he felt regretted that individual members were not satisfied with his explanations. In accordance with the Standing Orders, he as **the Chairman** had the right to convene meetings and to decide on the procedures of the meetings. When Members came across procedural problems, they could raise questions about the rules of meetings but it should focus on the way to conduct the present meeting.

11. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** stated that he could not understand based on what reasons **the Chairman** told **the Secretary** that there was no need to reply whether the funding applications complied with Section 61(a) and (b) of the District Council Ordinance. He reiterated that whether the funding applications complied with Section 61(a) and (b) of the “DCs Ordinance ” would have direct impact on whether the funding exercise should be handled and whether the Secretariat should provide service to it. He also stated that relevant applications involved a large amount of subsidy and it was more appropriate for the District Council (DC) to discuss and vet and approve the applications. He requested **the Chairman** and **the Secretary** to provide a reply on the role played by DC in deciding whether the activities were within the DC funding coverage and to make clarifications on the relevant ordinance and whether funding should be approved.

12. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** enquired whether today’s discussion items complied with the DC funding criteria.

13. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** stated that as the financial year was coming to a close, he enquired whether the sponsoring organisations could hand in their transaction notes before 28 February if their funding applications were approved. He also stated that he was not opposed to the Study but viewed that it should be shifted to the next financial year to allow sufficient time for it.

14. **The Chairman** clarified that as it had not proceeded to discuss agenda item 1, he thus requested the **Secretary** to respond to whether the funding applications complied with Section 61(a) of the Ordinance later.

15. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** requested **the Chairman** and Members present to declare whether they knew or had any association with relevant applicant organisations or their members and whether they had any of their service or any conflict of interest that had to be declared. In addition, he stated that if the relevant agenda failed to comply with Section 61 of the District Councils Ordinance or was not within the funding coverage, then Members needed not attend the meeting. If the Chairman or Secretary did not answer the question on the funding coverage under Section 61 of the District Councils Ordinance, he would consider withdrawing from the meeting to avoid conflict of interest or attending to matters not within the confines of DC.

16. **The Chairman** asked **the Secretary** to provide an answer to the matters in respect of the funding manual and requested Ms Betty LAU, Senior Executive Officer (District Council) of the Kowloon City District Office (KCDC), to respond to the issue on whether the Study was in compliance with the terms of reference under the District Councils Ordinance.

17. **The Secretary** stated that funding for the Study was approved at an earlier DC meeting. According to the funding provisions, activities involving a subsidy exceeding \$150,000 had to be passed by the Administration and Finance Committee (AFC) after vetting and approval by the relevant committee. Furthermore, the Study would be conducted across the years and relevant expenses could be paid by the funding in 2021-22.

18. **Ms Betty Lau, SEO (District Council) of KCDO**, stated that in accordance with Section 61(a) and (b) of the District Councils Ordinance, the Study on Public Transport Demand aimed at exploring the public transport demand in Kowloon City District and was therefore amongst the matters to be discussed according to the functions of the district councils as set out in District Councils Ordinance. Upon a decision made by the Committee on the appointment of a consultant to undertake the Study, a funding approval would be sought from AFC. After the activity was approved by KCDC, the Director of Home Affairs or an officer authorised by her would grant funding for the activity if it was accepted that the activity was within the

coverage of the district council funds and subsidy.

19. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** said that there was no description in words but it was stated in the background of the project that the activity would involve cross-year funding and he asked the **Secretary** to confirm it. He also pointed out that even though the Study was a cross-year funding project, there was no urgency for its endorsement. Such a practice led people to think that DC was treated as a “teller machine” and that the funding application procedures were not reasonable.

20. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** said that the reply by **the Secretary** was too general and not specific. He asked **Ms Betty LAU** to explicitly state that the Study was in compliance with the District Councils Ordinance, to clearly define the functions of the meeting, the funding coverage, and the introduction under the funding coverage, and to provide specific details in respect of the functions and scope of coverage. He reiterated that he was not opposed to the Study but it should be handled with care to avoid contravention with the DC funding criteria of HAD or the DC functions as it involved public money. Furthermore, one of the functions of the Committee was to put forward views on the study of the transport problems in the District but it did not include the handling of funding applications. It was requested that the item be referred to the KCDC meetings for discussion.

21. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** stated that agenda items related to the Committee should first be discussed by the Committee before approval for the funding applications was given by AFC. Also, a decision was made for the Study to commence on 24 September 2020. Up to 4 December six organisations had submitted their funding applications and it was believed that they would like to have a reply as soon as possible. If they were handled by way of circulation of paper, Members might have insufficient time to study the contents of the paper and raise enquiries with relevant organisations. Furthermore, irrespective of the current term or the previous terms, **the Chairman** had the right to decide whether to resort to the way by circulation of paper or by the convention of meetings according to the contents of the agenda item under discussion. She hoped that Members would be aware that different funding amounts would be discussed at different meetings. If all matters were to be considered at DC meetings, the discussion might not be completed within two hours.

22. **Mr Joshua FUNG** pointed out that plenty of time had already been spent to discuss the rules of meetings and Members should now proceed to the discussion of

agenda items. He pointed out that if **Mr CHO Wui-hung** queried that the relevant agenda item did not comply with the provisions of District Councils Ordinance, he should mention the irregularities under the ordinance but should not repeatedly raise enquiries with the **Secretary** and KCDC. In addition, **Dr KWONG Po-yin** had mentioned that the funding was approved in September 2020 but **Mr CHO Wui-hung** did not raise any enquiry then and now he could not observe the meeting procedures. Also, he pointed out **Mr YANG Wing-kit** repeatedly mentioned that Members had treated KCDC as a “teller machine” and that was tantamount to an “argument against one’s conscience”. Members should discuss the facts and it was hoped that the **Chairman** would proceed to the discussion of agenda items in accordance with the established procedures.

23. **The Chairman** stated that he and **the Secretary** had clearly stated their position and **Ms Betty LAU** had provided an answer on whether the Study was in compliance with the functions of district councils. As **the Chairman**, he viewed that the funding was for the conduct of community activities. And, the decision by TTC was not final and the final approval was vested with the Director of Home Affairs or the officer authorised by her. There had been adequate discussion on the subject and the discussion should be concluded.

New Items

The Vetting and Approval of the Application for Study on Public Transport Demand in Kowloon City District (Paper No. 02/21)

Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited

24. **The Chairman** stated that an amount of \$500,000 for community engagement activities was passed at the TTC meeting held on 24 September 2020 for the conduct of the Study on Public Transport Demand in Kowloon City District (Study) and an open invitation was extended to non-governmental organisations and district bodies to submit their funding application. The application was closed on 4 December 2020 and the Secretariat had received six applications. The Secretariat had forwarded the relevant proposals to Members for reference by email before the meeting. The representatives of the six organisations were invited to attend the present meeting to answer the questions in respect of the proposals raised by Members.

25. **The Chairman** gave the first warning to **Mr YANG Wing-kit** and **Mr CHO Wui-hung** and reminded them that it was not the time for them to speak.

26. **The Chairman** gave the second warning to **Mr YANG Wing-kit** and requested him to stop speaking immediately. He was asked to leave the conference room immediately and was not allowed to return to the conference room to take part in the discussion of the present meeting.

27. **Mr MAN Leung-chin, representative of the Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited**, introduced its proposal. (Please refer to Appendix II for details. [#])

28. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** stated it could be deducted from the introduction that Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited had relevant experience required for the Study. She enquired about the indicator based on which the number of Kowloon City residents allowed to take part in the questionnaire survey was set at 300 and queried if the number was adequate for the purpose.

29. **Mr Pius YUM** suggested to increase the number of samples to avoid queries by other departments on the credibility of the Study.

30. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** stated that relevant funding applications were not in compliance with Section 61(b) of the District Councils Ordinance and were not within the funding coverage. Thus he queried the legality of the present meeting and withdrew from the meeting as a sign of protest. He further said that **Mr HO Hin-ming** had raised the same queries at the meeting held in September 2020.

31. **Mr MAN Leung-chin, representative of the Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited**, replied as follows:

- (i) according to the schedule of the original proposal, in order to maintain social distancing and reduce contact, it was designed that the number of questionnaire samples would be 300 as pandemic was rampant then. The questionnaire which was detailed and well-defined would require 15 minutes to complete. Three surveyors would be arranged to conduct on-the-spot questionnaire

[#]All appendices are protected by copyright. Please contact the DC Secretariat or the relevant copyright holder (whichever is appropriate) if references are made to them.

survey which was expected to last for 3 to 4 days;

- (ii) as a follow-up procedure related to data input was required for the format of the questionnaire afterwards, his company made ready an electronic recorder. If DC would coordinate by placing the questionnaires online for completion by local residents, 300 questionnaires was the basic number estimated to be collected. Also, attempts would be made for people concerned to complete the questionnaire within a week via other hyperlinks or websites so that the questionnaire survey could be promoted through the coordination of KCDO or KCDC as local residents were encouraged to join and data obtained would also be analysed together;
- (iii) if more than 300 questionnaires were received, their data would also be considered and analysed, and 300 survey questionnaires was the minimum number of samples that could be confirmed.

32. **Mr PUN Kwok-wah** pointed out that every company had different design for their questionnaires and suggested that a sample of the questions be provided to DC for reference by Members beforehand by the organisations.

33. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** stated people of different social strata in Kowloon City District were commuters of public transport. If the sample lacked representativeness, it would affect the recognition of the whole Study. She also opined that the number of samples was not an effective indicator, instead, random sampling should be conducted in the questionnaire survey. If it only resorted to the online platform, it would only collect the views of some people but fail to reflect those of local residents. In addition, as a result of manpower constraint, the population in the district was not the prime consideration judging from the number of samples of the Study. She enquired whether there were any other means to make up for the deficiency.

34. **Mr MAN Leung-chin, representative of the Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited**, replied as follows:

- (i) before the survey, arrangements would be made for the working group to confirm the contents of the questionnaire such as circulating the questions and relevant format to Members for reference in order to make amendments to complement with the characteristics and

demands of Kowloon City District;

- (ii) while conducting the survey, Members would be informed of the locations of the survey such as some of main bus stops, MTR exits or the gates of relevant ferry piers. Also, public transport commuters would be interviewed and the survey would not be conducted randomly just in certain streets of Kowloon City District. Then all relevant data would be clearly reported to Members to facilitate them to make proposals;
- (iii) if more than 300 questionnaires were received additional resources would be required. If the social distancing requirement was relaxed and resources permitted, the number of samples could be increased. Though it could only be confirmed at the present moment that at least 300 survey questionnaires would be collected, if their bid was successful, considerations could be made to input more resources for the questionnaire survey depending on circumstances.

35. **Mr WONG Wing-kit** said that the project involved the transport demand of the whole Kowloon City District and enquired whether sampling would be conducted in different areas of Kowloon City District such as Kowloon City, To Kwa Wan, Hung Hom, Ho Man Tin, Kai Tak, etc. It was also suggested that people of different age groups should be interviewed at various locations for diversification of the survey respondents.

36. **Mr MAN Leung-chin, representative of the Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited**, stated that Members' views would be sought when the survey locations were proposed. Public transport demand might vary when there were new development areas such as Kai Tak were developed. And the survey locations would be finalised according to the situation and Members' awareness.

37. **Mr Pius YUM** enquired whether the representative of the company was willing to respond to the Committee's request to provide its previous questionnaire sample for its reference later.

38. **Mr MAN Leung-chin, representative of the Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited**, stated that similar surveys had been conducted by them for other district councils. After authorisation was obtained, they would provide

relevant questionnaire samples to Members for reference. Also, they could provide another sample questionnaire for Members' reference.

Public Transport Research Team

39. **Mr Ben HON of the Public Transport Research Team** introduced the proposal. (Please refer to Appendix I for details.[#])

40. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** enquired about the way to ensure that the questionnaires would be returned and that the survey findings of different areas of Kowloon City District would be completely reflected in a random manner. In addition, she pointed out that if the resources were only placed on the conduct of the questionnaire survey and the analysis of the survey findings on the mode of travel, it might be difficult to make overall proposals for Tuen Ma Line Phase II after its commissioning. Thus it was proposed that the current service data in respect of buses, minibuses and other public transport tools be added to facilitate studies on the improvement of the existing service and demands so as to meet the needs of the local residents.

41. **Mr TSANG Kin-chiu** pointed out that more than \$300,000 out of the \$500,000 under the proposal was used for outsourced service and he requested the provision of supplementary information of these companies.

42. **Mr Ben HON of the Public Transport Research Team** replied as follows:

- (i) generally speaking, online questionnaire survey and the deposition of the questionnaires into the letter boxes would bring about better return rate but it was not done in a sufficiently random manner. The return rate for questionnaires dropped at letter boxes ranged from 5% to 10% which was equivalent to that of the on-street questionnaire survey;
- (ii) he did not rule out the risk associated with efficiency but the return rate was guaranteed. When necessary, the survey could be conducted in individual areas or designated places instead of officially demarcated districts. For areas with relatively higher

[#]All appendices are protected by copyright. Please contact the DC Secretariat or the relevant copyright holder (whichever is appropriate) if references are made to them.

return rate previously such as Whampoa, their estimated level of the rate of return was achieved after the supplementary survey but Hoi Sham District failed to meet the target. A site questionnaire survey would be arranged in Hoi Sham District;

- (iii) the survey would be mainly conducted online or deposited into letter boxes and the site and online questionnaires would play a supplementary role;
- (iv) most of the transport service of Kowloon City District was east bound and if the provision of the data in terms of the present transport service in the district was required, the issue of efficiency and cost should be considered;
- (v) apart from the current demand and service such as observing the service of bus route 5C in Hung Hom, there was difficulty in distinguishing the user population in To Kwa Wan, Hung Hom and Kowloon City areas. Besides, other difficulties would be encountered in terms of the way in which the Study was conducted;
- (vi) in case the survey was carried out at a certain time session, the condition in other time sessions would be neglected. As such, it was decided to use questionnaires to collect information in different time sessions;
- (vii) as a result of the consideration on cost, it would be difficult to provide information in terms of the current transport demand and service;
- (viii) when submitting funding applications at other meetings previously, it was demanded that outsourced companies had to be used. Thus the present proposal was prepared in line with this principle. As funding needed to be provided before the outsourced company called for an open tender, relevant information could not be provided at present. If Members viewed that no outsourced company should be hired, the applicant could take over the whole job.

Lok Fung (HK) Ltd.

43. **Mr Clive LAW, representative of Lok Fung (Hong Kong) Ltd.,** introduced the proposal. (Please refer to Appendix III for details.[#])

44. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** stated that the proposal was informative and provided solutions to some of the issues with which she was concerned. She appreciated the way the number of samples was calculated and the survey was conducted. She pointed out that as it was said in the proposal that 10 000 questionnaires would be distributed including distribution by QR Code, she enquired whether the organisation could guarantee the effectiveness. On the other hand, more resources were input into the community involvement part than other parts of the proposal. She enquired about the estimated number of participants in community involvement whom could be contacted and the way to reach the target effectiveness.

45. **Mr TSANG Kin-chiu** said it was stated in the proposal that an interactive platform would be provided in Part B in the third stage of the Study but no information about the interactive platform was available. He enquired whether an online platform such as a Facebook page or mobile applications would be provided for the collection of views apart from the use of paper items, the organisation of study groups and the implementation of a questionnaire survey. He further pointed out that an interactive element was very important for in-depth investigation and continued collection of the views of local residents in Kowloon City.

46. **Mr Clive LAW, representative of Lok Fung (Hong Kong) Ltd.,** replied that apart from distributing about 10 000 questionnaires in the first stage, it was hoped that the residents would be invited to their workshops which could be held at the community centres or the venues of non-profit-making organisations and each workshop could accommodate 100 to 200 participants. As for the interactive platform, apart from the workshops, street stalls would be set up at some of the busy areas and junctions in Kowloon City District with heavy flow of people such as the open space off MTR Whampoa Station or Ma Tau Wai Estate, etc. Applications in advance would be made for setting up street stalls and erecting display boards for enquiries and expression of views by residents.

[#]All appendices are protected by copyright. Please contact the DC Secretariat or the relevant copyright holder (whichever is appropriate) if references are made to them.

47. **Ms Crystal LEE of Lok Fung (Hong Kong) Ltd.** supplemented that the site of the workshops would be located at places near the community such as the Holy Carpenter Church, Lutheran Martha Boss, Kai Tak and Hung Hom community centres, etc. to provide convenience to residents. As for publicity work, posters would be put up at the display boards of buildings and public places and stops of public transport means besides online promotion. When questionnaires were collected, attention of the respondents would also be drawn so that members of the public learnt of the activity.

48. **Mr TSANG Kin-chiu** enquired whether different channels such as Whatsapp, Telegram or Facebook web pages had been set up.

49. **Mr Clive LAW, representative of Lok Fung (Hong Kong) Ltd.,** replied that a Facebook transport page was separately opened for Kowloon City District, Southern District, Wan Chai, Eastern District and Central and Western District and the web pages were the main channel of communication with the residents of Kowloon City District for the time being.

50. **Mr TSANG Kin-chiu** stated that his Facebook page set up in the name of DC member always received the image of the transport webpage of Kowloon City District on Facebook and he believed that other members also had the same experience. He was of the view that the information collected was clear and well distributed and he asked **the Chairman** whether interests in relation to the logo was declared.

51. **The Chairman** stated that even though there was communication on the Internet previously, it did not lead to conflict of interest. As such, Members needed not declare it separately.

52. **Mr TSANG Kin-chiu** said that the Facebook information was very clear and there was a sharing of such information previously. However, there was no special mentioning of it in the proposal and he hoped that a detailed introduction on it would be made later. He also enquired whether Facebook or other cyber channels could be used for the distribution of the questionnaires.

53. **The Chairman** enquired **Lok Fung (Hong Kong) Ltd.** its relationship with that Facebook page and requested it to explain its relationship with the Facebook page of other districts if circumstances allowed, as he believed that members of the public

would like to know the use of public money.

54. **Mr MA Hei-pang** had reservations about the use of the QR Code in conducting the questionnaire survey and was worried that relevant sampling had its inherent discrepancy. At present, the online platform was mainly used by young people and the elderly might not be able to express their views on the public transport demand via online platforms. In addition, he enquired about the proportion of information collected via street stalls and the budget for the plan.

55. **Mr Clive LAW, representative of Lok Fung (Hong Kong) Ltd.**, stated that the Facebook transport page of Kowloon City District was one of the Facebook pages of Transport Research & Innovation Partners (Hong Kong) Ltd. which also owned the Facebook transport page of the transport of Southern District, Eastern District, Wan Chai and Central and Western District. Most of the Facebook transport pages were for communication with DC members. Also, he understood that the use of QR Code on the Internet for conducting the questionnaire survey was mainly targeted at young people and he would make use of street stalls to invite participation of the elderly and provide assistance to them. It was hoped that street stalls would be set up for ten times at different locations and they would try to ensure that each of the two sampling methods would cover 50% of the questionnaires. Though face-to-face interview could not be conducted because of the pandemic and the social distancing restriction order, it would try to balance the demand of the two groups.

56. **Ms Crystal LEE of Lok Fung (Hong Kong) Ltd.** supplemented that the paper questionnaires would be mailed via the Hongkong Post Circular Service. Furthermore, to facilitate the collection of the questionnaires, a collection box would also be placed at the lobby of public housing blocks to cope with the needs of different districts and people of different ages.

57. **Mr Pius YUM** stated he would like to enquire whether the Facebook transport page of Kowloon City District was opened for commercial profit-making purposes.

58. **Mr WONG Wing-kit** stated that it was shown in the schedule that there were focus group workshops covering the public transport operators and community involvement activities held by the community organisations at the third stage and he enquired about the details.

59. **Mr Clive LAW, representative of Lok Fung (Hong Kong) Ltd.**, replied that the Facebook transport page of Kowloon City District had never been used for any commercial profit-making purposes. Other districts including Eastern District, Southern District and Central and Western District had not been involved in any commercial profit-making matters up to the present. The focus group workshops hoped to hold discussions with different stakeholders, operators and residents to discuss the findings of the first stage survey and formulate options. The workshops would also be organised at different districts.

Skywalk Consultants Ltd.

60. **Mr Nelson TANG, representative of Skywalk Consultants Ltd.**, stated that in response to the commissioning of the MTR service in To Kwa Wan and Sung Wong Toi in the third quarter of 2021, adjustments needed to be made to the bus and mini-bus routes afterwards. If the residents chose to take MTR, the use of land transport would be reduced and that would ease the traffic condition of Kowloon City District would be eased. They would ask bus commuters about their destination via face-to-face interviews, for example, off Hong Kong BMW Showroom in Ma Tau Wai Road for the collection of data for the smooth re-organisation of the public transport programme. In addition, more data would be collected to study whether traffic improvements were required on some of the roads in the District.

61. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** stated that the number of participants and observers was not listed in the proposal but the survey jobs were itemized without mentioning whether the three types of survey jobs would be carried out simultaneously or different methods corresponding to the situation would be chosen. As **Tin Lee Consulting (Hong Kong) Ltd.** had provided consultation service to MTR, it was viewed that it could take up the transport consultation work. As the present Study was a community involvement programme, she enquired about the proportion of community involvement. She also asked whether the shops would be affected or there was any conflict of interest after the reorganisation of MTR service.

62. **Mr TANG Ka-cheong, representative of Tin Lee Consulting (Hong Kong) Ltd.**, replied that his company did not own any shop or property in Kowloon City District and thus there was no potential conflict of interest. A group comprising 3 to 4 persons would be mainly responsible for the present project and the face-to-face interviews would be conducted by part-time staff in order to save resources.

63. **Mr Pius YUM** was disappointed with the introduction in which the number of samples was not mentioned and also no briefing was provided. A total funding of \$480,000 was applied for in the tender documents but no relevant details were provided. He asked the company whether it had any demographic information of Kowloon City District and if a transport demand study was carried out in the District, whether the minimum number of samples would be taken under the social gathering restriction order in effect and the pandemic.

64. **Mr TANG Ka-cheong, representative of Tin Lee Consulting (Hong Kong) Ltd.,** replied that as the tender requirements under the proposal were rather general, his company was unable to consider relevant issues for the time being and if they were successful in the tender bid, they would accord top priority to the formulation of work details.

Business, Economics and Public Policy Research Centre of the Hong Kong Shue Yan University

65. **Dr LEE Shu-kam of the Business, Economics and Public Policy Research Centre of the Hong Kong Shue Yan University** introduced the details of the proposal. (Please refer to Appendix IV for details.[#])

66. **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** stated that no breakdowns were provided in the funding application and enquired whether there were breakdowns in the budget and the way funding was used.

67. **Dr LEE Shu-kam of the Business, Economics and Public Policy Research Centre of the Hong Kong Shue Yan University** replied that the funds were mainly used for recruitment, drafting, pay for the research staff and other production expenses. Supplementary information would be provided if necessary.

68. **The Chairman** said that as a ballot would be held after the introduction by relevant companies and enquired whether elaboration on the breakdowns could be provided or the supplementary papers would be circulated instantly.

69. **Dr LEE Shu-kam of the Business, Economics and Public Policy Research Centre of the Hong Kong Shue Yan University** replied that the funding was mainly

[#]All appendices are protected by copyright. Please contact the DC Secretariat or the relevant copyright holder (whichever is appropriate) if references are made to them.

used in recruiting interviewers. Collection of the 1 500 samples required the recruitment and arrangement of manpower for supervision, publicity and education as well as providing manpower of different levels for the job. Also, some funding was needed for the planning and writing the report for the project and he hoped that the breakdown might be provided after the Q&A session, i.e. before the afternoon.

70. **The Secretary** requested a speedy provision of the supplementary information before the ballot.

71. **Dr LEE Shu-kam of the Business, Economics and Public Policy Research Centre of the Hong Kong Shue Yan University** replied that he would ask his colleagues to prepare the information as soon as possible and apologised for his negligence.

72. **Mr MA Hei-pang** pointed out that **Dr LEE Shu-kam** had participated in the study on improvement measures to the traffic congestion in Kwun Tong in 2018 and feasible improvement options were proposed in his report such as the shift of two-way traffic to one-way traffic in Hoi Yuen Road, Kwun Tong and the shift to one-way north bound traffic in the area of Hip Wo Street and Yue Man Square to reduce traffic entering the Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout. He enquired whether such proposals were finally implemented.

73. **Dr LEE Shu-kam of the Business, Economics and Public Policy Research Centre of the Hong Kong Shue Yan University** stated that he did not follow up whether the proposals were implemented one by one but it was learnt that a pedestrian network area welcomed by the residents was built in a later stage. Though more land was required and passing through part of the buildings was technically difficult to some extent, the proposal for building a railway was the most appropriate solution for improving transport service and traffic under the then constraints.

74. **The Chairman** stated that when the Secretariat received the supplementary information, it would be forwarded to the Committee for action.

Ho Wang SPB Ltd.

75. **Mr Tinson LEUNG of Ho Wang SPB Ltd.** introduced the proposal. (Please refer to Appendix V for details. [#])

76. **Mr TSANG Kin-chiu** expressed appreciation as the proposal was detailed and informative. He noted that **Ho Wang SPB Ltd.** was experienced as shown by using 200 questionnaires which was less than those of other companies. He enquired whether the 200 questionnaires would be shared by different areas. The proposal showed that Members would help collect the questionnaires but it was not mentioned whether interviewers would be arranged to conduct the survey. Furthermore, he asked the company to explain whether it was because of the pandemic that no questionnaire survey would be conducted in the district and whether every KCDC member was expected to help with the questionnaire survey.

77. **Mr Tinson LEUNG of Ho Wang SPB Ltd.** stated that the number of questionnaires was raised with reference to the previous experience in other districts. He said that the work would not be entirely conducted by DC members and it was planned at present to distribute 5,000 questionnaires in different areas. According to the previous experience in distributing e-questionnaires, as many as 2 000 questionnaires would be collected. At the same time, interviewers would be arranged to distribute the questionnaires at bus terminals and thus the work would not be conducted solely by DC members.

78. **Mr TSANG Kin-chiu** was thankful to **Ho Wang SPB Ltd.** for giving the briefing and relevant clarifications. He reminded that before authorisation was given by DC, its logo should not be used in the briefing. In addition, he also enquired whether questionnaires for collecting views would be distributed in different areas such as Kowloon City, Kowloon Tong, Kai Tak, etc.

79. **Mr LEUNG Tin-shing of Ho Wang SPB Ltd.** stated that the number of questionnaires was only an initial proposal and its number was subject to discussion. The questionnaires would be distributed in areas with more people flow and it was initially proposed that they would be distributed in the area covered by the Tuen Ma

[#]All appendices are protected by copyright. Please contact the DC Secretariat or the relevant copyright holder (whichever is appropriate) if references are made to them.

Line and the passageways near bus stops.

80. **Mr Pius YUM** appreciated the detailed and informative briefing delivered by **Ho Wang SPB Ltd.** He opined that the Study should also cover red minibuses.

81. **The Chairman** said that he had just received the supplementary information from the **Business, Economics and Public Policy Research Centre of the Hong Kong Shue Yan University** and gave instructions to present it to Members on the screen. He announced that the meeting would be temporarily adjourned.

(The meeting was temporarily adjourned for 5 minutes.)

82. **The Chairman** instructed the **Secretary** to circulate relevant supplementary information by written form and invited all Members to make additions before the ballot.

83. **Mr TSANG Kin-chiu** said that the various proposals and the supplementary information were very informative and some organisations would need to provide supplementary information after the meeting. Thus more time was needed for their consideration. Furthermore, he noticed that some organisations did not provide a breakdown of expenses and other information in the same form and some organisations only submitted the two-page form without attaching any supplementary information. He thus asked the Secretariat whether the same level of requirements were placed on the six organisations. At the same time, some organisations did not provide their company registration information. He suggested to set a one-week deadline for the organisations to provide supplementary information so that Members could have access to more complete information in order to fully and fairly compare the applications of the organisations before coming to a decision.

84. **The Chairman** stated that as some Members were not present at the meeting and some had left the meeting earlier than scheduled, he suggested to allow time for Members to examine the supplementary information provided by **the Business, Economics and Public Policy Research Centre of the Hong Kong Shue Yan University** and arrangements were made for the voting to be conducted at the 7th and 8th combined meeting of TTC under Matters Arising. The Chairman also instructed the Secretariat to upload the audio recording of the meeting onto the website of KCDC for reference by Members and members of the public beforehand.

85. **Mr Pius YUM** stated that as there were members raising objection and withdrawing from the meeting at the initial stage of the meeting, there should be channels requiring Members to inform the Secretariat the questions they were going to put up before the deadline specified so that the Secretariat could make enquiries with the relevant organisations to avoid the occurrence of similar incidents.

86. **The Chairman** asked **the Secretary** whether Members could raise questions in written form before the deadline for putting forward the questions and thus the questions and replies would be provided to Members for reference.

87. **The Secretary** stated that as time was needed for addressing the various issues, it was suggested that next Thursday, i.e. the 25th February was the deadline and the questions received would be tabled for discussion at the TTC meeting. In addition, she would distribute the briefing to Members later on and the video was scheduled to be uploaded onto the KCDC website on Monday.

Any Other Business

88. **The Chairman** stated it was believed that all Members had taken note that it was passed by DC that funding for the present Study on Public Transport Demand was reserved. The funding was approved at TTC meeting held in September 2020 and funding applications were accepted and ended in December 2020. However, the application vetting and approval procedures were delayed until February 2021 because of the pandemic. As the Chairman of TTC, he had separate communication on the issue with the secretary of DC and TTC and the decision was not made solely by him. As there were relatively more applicant organisations, he viewed that Members should fully understand the proposals of the relevant organisations before they could make a choice to the best interest of the whole District.

89. He had considered resorting to different means for Members to understand the relevant proposals including circulating papers, holding meetings, video conferences, etc. Resolution of the present funding exercise was originally scheduled at the 7th TTC meeting before the Lunar New Year but was postponed to the present due to the fourth round of the pandemic. If it was postponed too long, the efficacy of the Study would be affected and then cause inconvenience to the six applicant organisations. As such, he viewed that the funding applications should be handled as soon as possible. Though he had considered conducting the 7th TTC meeting today so that apart from handling the funding applications, the TTC agenda

items pending discussion for long time could also be tackled to ease the tight schedule. However, as the meeting could not be too long under the present pandemic, it was decided to hold the present special meeting to handle the funding applications. He was of the view that Members would contribute to the best interest and wellness of the local residents when handling the applications and there was no conspiracy. He had confidence in the initial good intention of Members and they would take into consideration the best interest and wellness of local residents in conducting the Study and handling other funding applications. He hoped to have the understanding of Members and members of the public on the ways the meeting was handled and the procedures for approving the funding applications in case of deficiency. He hoped that TTC and all Members would continue to put forward their views on the transport matters of Kowloon City District and contribute to the wellness of its residents.

Date of Next Meeting

90. The minutes of this meeting were confirmed on 29 April 2021.

The Chairman

The Secretary

Kowloon City District Council
March 2021