

**The 7th and 8th Combined Meeting of
the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) of
the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC)**

Date: 4 March 2021 (Thursday)
Time: 2:30 p.m.
Venue: Conference Room, Kowloon City District Office,
7/F, Kowloon City Government Offices,
42 Bailey Street, Kowloon

Present:

Vice-chairman: Mr FUNG Man-tao, Joshua
Members: Mr WONG Wing-kit
Mr LAI Kwong-wai (Left at 5:25 p.m.)
Miss CHAU Hei-man (Left at 5:25 p.m.)
Mr PUN Kwok-wah, JP
Mr KWOK Tin-lap (Arrived at 2:48 p.m.)
(Left at 5:25 p.m.)
Mr LAM Tak-shing
Mr YUM Kwok-tung, Pius
Miss MAK Sui-ki, Jakki (Left at 5:25 p.m.)
Mr SIU Leong-sing (Left at 5:21 p.m.)
Mr WONG Kwok-tung, Daniel
Mr TSANG Kin-chiu (Left at 4:51 p.m.)
Mr YEUNG Chun-yu
Mr HE Huahan (Left at 4:58 p.m.)
Dr KWAN Ka-lun (Left at 5:25 p.m.)
Mr MA Hei-pang (Left at 5:25 p.m.)
Mr NG Po-keung, MH (Arrived at 3:59 p.m.)
Mr HO Hin-ming, BBS, MH (Left at 5:25 p.m.)
Mr CHO Wui-hung, MH
Mr CHEUNG King-fan
Mr YANG Wing-kit (Arrived at 2:51 p.m.)
Dr KWONG Po-yin

Absent:

Mr LEE Hin-long
Ms LEUNG Yuen-ting
The Hon LEE Wai-king, Starry, SBS,
JP

Secretary:	Miss LEE Cheuk-yan, Charmaine	Executive Officer (District Council) 1, Kowloon City District Office
<u>In Attendance:</u>	Mr KAN Yiu-chun, Melvin	Assistant District Officer (Kowloon City)
	Mr LEUNG Yat-kiu, Silas	Senior Transport Officer / Kowloon City 2, Transport Department
	Ms YUE Ka-ka	Senior Transport Officer / Kai Tak and Kowloon Bay, Transport Department
	Mr MACK Ting-kai	Engineer / Hung Hom, Transport Department
	Ms LUK Nga-yee, Christine	Engineer / Kowloon City, Transport Department
	Mr WONG Siu-cheung	Operation Officer (Kowloon City), Hong Kong Police Force
	Mr PO Yiu-wa	Officer-in-charge, Traffic Team (Kowloon City), Hong Kong Police Force
	Mr HO Chi-kin	Officer-in-charge, Traffic Team (Sau Mau Ping), Hong Kong Police Force
	Mr CHIU Tsz-wai	Project Coordinator / Kowloon East (District), Highways Department
	Mr YIP Yuk-tsang	District Engineer / Hung Hom, Highways Department
<u>Attendance by Invitation:</u>		
Item 4	Mr MAN Yui-chit, Michael	Senior Transport Officer / Bus / Kowloon, Transport Department
	Mr HO Chun-kit, Ethan	Transport Officer / Bus / Kowloon, Transport Department
	Mr WONG Tsz-kin	Manager (Operations), Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
	Mr Luka LAI	Senior Operation Support Officer, Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
	Miss LIP Pui-lam	Senior Officer (Public Affairs), Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
	Mr Simon WONG	Planning and Scheduling Manager, Citybus Limited / New World First Bus Services

	Mr Calvin WONG	Limited Chief Planning Officer, Citybus Limited / New World First Bus Services Limited
	Ms Joyce WAN	Assistant Public Affairs Manager, Citybus Limited / New World First Bus Services Limited
Item 6	Miss HUI Wing-yin	Engineer / Security / Electronic Project 3, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department
	Mr WU Man-kit	Electronic Engineer / Project 1 / 1, Transport Department
Item 12 to 14	Mr CHOW Ka-lok, Vincent	Engineer / Yau Tsim, Transport Department
	Ms YAU Kit-yu, Ada	Engineer / Kowloon (Housing and Planning) 3, Transport Department

* * *

The Vice-chairman of the Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) welcomed Members, representatives of government departments and organisations to the meeting. **The Vice-chairman** stated that as Mr LEE Hin-long, the Chairman of the TTC, could not attend today's meeting due to other affairs, he would stand in for him and perform the duties of the Chairman including presiding at meetings according to Order 35(3) of the Kowloon City District Council Standing Orders (Standing Orders). He then reminded Members to declare interests in accordance with the Standing Orders and 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.

Item 1

Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting

2. The minutes of the 6th meeting were unanimously confirmed by the Committee without amendments

Matters Arising

Item 2

Concern over the Arrangements for Kowloon GMB Route 6 (Paper No. 112/20)

3. **Mr Silas LEUNG, Senior Transport Officer / Kowloon City 2 of the Transport Department (TD)**, introduced Paper No. 112/20 and provided the following supplementary information:

- (i) GMB Route 26A had been operated since 1 November 2020 and the passenger volume in the first three weeks increased gradually. Yet, due to the deterioration of the pandemic, the passenger volume kept decreasing and only rebounded one week before this meeting. The operator had, in December last year, discussed and explored with the TD the possibility of re-routing and extending the route to Tsim Sha Tsui in a bid to increase the passenger volume. Given that the pandemic gradually subsided in recent days, to facilitate the resumption of work and school, the TD would discuss again with the operator the possibility of re-routing the bus route and consult committee members' opinions later; and
- (ii) the TD was now considering adjusting GMB Route 13C to a supplementary service route. The Department would closely monitor the passenger volume of the route and report to committee members in a timely manner.

4. **Mr Pius YUM** stated that the newly operated GMB Route 26A did not travel via the area of Hung Hom Bay. He wished that the Department could consider arranging the route to go past Tak Man Street during peak hours when discussing the introduction of special runs of the route with the operator.

5. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** thanked the Department for taking the initiative to contact with minibus companies. She said that since GMB Route 6 and 6X were cancelled, residents living on Oi King Street could hardly travel to Tsim Sha Tsui by public transport. She also pointed out that in the past, there had always been a long queue waiting for GMB Route 6X on Oi King Street in the morning. Thus, adjusting Route 13C alone would not help meet the demand effectively. She hoped that the

Department could discuss with the operator and introduce special runs which travelled past Oi King Street during peak hours with a view to satisfying the demand of residents in Harbour Place who would like to go to Tsim Sha Tsui.

6. **Mr Silas LEUNG of TD** noted Mr Pius YUM and Dr KWONG Po-yin's opinions. The Department would discuss with the operator and consider introducing special runs which travelled past the road sections mentioned by the two members. The Department would submit a written reply and report the progress of the issue to the committee members at a later time.

7. **The Vice-chairman** instructed the Secretary to follow up with the TD on the report of progress of the issue.

Strong Request for Strengthening Law Enforcement at Traffic Black Spots in Hung Hom Old District and Establishing No Parking Zones on the Road Surface (Paper No. 124/20)

8. **Mr PO Yiu-wa, Officer-in-charge of the Traffic Team (Kowloon City) of Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF)**, made a report as follows:

- (i) since August last year, the HKPF had included all traffic blackspots in Hung Hom old district into the scope of the "Project Eternity". The Police noticed that florists vans and funeral vehicles illegally parked in the district as well as miscellaneous items placed on roads always caused obstruction. Hence, Kowloon City Division had carried out publicity and education work in Hung Hom old district between 21 January and 26 January in hope of improving the condition from various aspects;
- (ii) the HKPF had converted the metered parking spaces for tourist coaches outside the car park at 2 Cheong Tung Road to parking areas for hearses between 24 January and 6 February in order to learn about the impact of hearse parking on the traffic in the district; and
- (iii) regarding the problem of road obstruction, the HKPF would issue penalty tickets against illegal parking offences and take enforcement actions by means of mobile video recording from time to time. Moreover, the HKPF and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) would carry out joint actions in Hung Hom old

district including removing miscellaneous items placed outside florists and coffin shops blocking the road and initiating prosecution against vehicles illegally parked, etc. He stated that as a series of promotion, education and enforcement work was taken, the problem of road obstruction was alleviated. He wished that the relevant stakeholders would continue to comply with the requirements of the Police in future.

9. **Mr LAM Tak-shing** said that the joint operations conducted and the pilot schemes launched by the HKPF and the FEHD in the past could lessen road obstruction in the district effectively. He hoped that the relevant departments could continue to carry out the relevant work and strengthen enforcement to further rectify the problem. He advised the HKPF to follow up the problem of illegal parking at intersections, turning areas and pedestrian crossings on Cooke Street, Baker Street and Lo Lung Hang Street. In addition, as the traffic at these locations was always congested, some drivers sounded their car horns frequently, causing nuisances to residents nearby. Also, he stated that disabled driver parking spaces on Lo Lung Hang Street were always occupied by miscellaneous items or vehicles of florists and thus they could not be used by people in need. He wished that the Police could deploy additional manpower to carry out inspections at the site so as to ensure that the spaces were unoccupied.

10. **Mr PO Yiu-wa of HKPF** noted the relevant opinions and would relay them to Hung Hom Division for follow-ups.

11. **Mr MACK Ting-kai, Engineer / Hung Hom of the TD**, remarked that the Department was all along concerned about the traffic condition in Hung Hom old district. They noticed that some drivers parked their vehicles illegally at turns and pedestrian crossings, causing inconvenience to pedestrians and even giving rise to accidents. Thus, the TD had already called meetings with the relevant stakeholders and representatives from the funeral industry and proposed a series of improvement measures such as demarcating 24-hour no-stopping restriction zones and / or pedestrian crossings at different locations in the district including the pedestrian crossings at Chatham Road North and Baker Street, the area around the pedestrian crossings on Wuhu Street, Kun Yam Street and Bulkeley Street, the area around the pedestrian crossing at Bulkeley Street near Whampoa Street, the intersection of Lo Lung Hang Street and Winslow Street, the turns at Cheong Hang Road and the pavement and carriageway opposite to China Travel Hip Kee Godown Company (HK) Limited No. 1 on Winslow Street. The Department hoped that the aforesaid measures could rectify the problem of illegal parking at these locations effectively and minimise the impact on

pedestrians.

12. **Mr LAM Tak-shing** stated that the problems of illegal parking and parking at turns were serious. He wished that the Police could assist the TD in implementing the aforesaid measures as soon as possible and marking 24-hour no-stopping restriction zones at the abovementioned locations in a bid to improve the traffic problem in the district.

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

13. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** said that some committee members did not attend the first special meeting of the TTC. Thus, she enquired about whether members had received the presentations provided by tenderers before the meeting so that they could select a study project which could facilitate community participation by locals of the entire Kowloon City District.

14. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** stated that he had no objection to conducting the relevant study but he questioned whether the funding must be approved in this meeting. He had mentioned in the first special meeting that this financial year was coming to a close and the entire application process was delayed. Thus, he viewed that the allocation for the relevant study should be discussed in the next financial year and tenders should be re-invited again so as to allow sufficient time for the Committee to handle applications and ensure the fairness of the process.

15. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary**, remarked that after the first special meeting, the Secretariat had sent all the supplementary information submitted by tenderers to committee members.

16. **Mr KWOK Tin-lap** declared interests and said that Mr CHENG Hin-ki was the Chairman of the Public Transport Research Team as well as the President of the Social and Political Organisation Workers' Union. Also, Mr KWOK himself was the advisor of the Social and Political Organisation Workers' Union. Thus, he considered himself not suitable to participate in the voting for this agenda item.

17. **The Vice-chairman** ruled that Mr KWOK Tin-lap could not participate in the voting for this issue.

18. **Mr MA Hei-pang** disagreed with Mr YANG Wing-kit. He said that the study aimed to assess the traffic demand before the commissioning of Tuen Ma Line Phase 2 in Kowloon City District for TTC's reference. He was worried that if the study was further delayed, the impacts of the new railway to the public transport in the district could not be assessed. Moreover, he pointed out that committee members had discussed this issue in previous meetings and the Secretariat had sent the paper to members in advance. Members should have fully understood the need to carry out the study and hence the funding application for the study should be vetted and approved in this meeting.

19. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** said that in the previous special meeting, the Secretariat did not give a reply on whether the study complied with the regulations stipulated in Section 61(b) of the District Councils Ordinance. He asked the Secretariat again whether the study was consistent with the Manual on the Use of District Council Funds (the Manual) amended by the Home Affairs Department (HAD) in January 2020 and Section 61(b) of the District Councils Ordinance (Cap. 547) .

20. **Mr HO Hin-ming** enquired whether invitation letters for tenders were issued to the public and whether the objectives, requirements and contents of the study were clearly specified in the letters. He opined that the invitation letters did not clearly lay out the objectives and requirements mentioned by Mr MA Hei-pang, which would lead to a waste of funding. In addition, he asked whether the KCDC was empowered to conduct the study.

21. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (i) he disagreed with the member who remarked that the relevant study had been prepared for a long time and it was necessary to process the funding applications for the study instantly. He pointed out that if the funding applications were processed right away upon the close of application on 4 December, he would raise no objection. However, in view of the pandemic, the entire application process was delayed. Some companies which intended to submit tenders might be concerned about the development of the pandemic and the time constraints and thus they did not submit applications. He viewed that if these companies noted that the entire application process was deferred, they might consider re-submitting tenders. Hence, the current practice was unfair to these companies; and (ii) he stated that the next financial year was about to begin and all tenderers had postponed their study to August. Thus, he requested for transferring the funding for the study to the budget of next financial year and re-inviting companies

to submit tenders by the beginning of April so that interested companies could have a chance to lodge applications, and fairness and impartiality of the retendering exercise could thus be ensured.

22. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary**, answered Mr HO Hin-ming's questions, saying that at the tendering stage, the Secretariat had uploaded the invitation letter for tenders to the KCDC webpage, which was also sent to university research centres and consultancies chosen by the TD.

23. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** put forward the following views and enquiries: (i) she pointed out that the TTC had discussed Paper No. 105/20 titled "Public Transport Demand Study in Kowloon City District" (agenda item 18) in the fifth meeting on 24 September 2020. Moreover, during the discussion of agenda item 24 titled "Any Other Business" in the sixth meeting on 12 November 2020, the Chairman had furthered enquired about the details of the study; (ii) she stated that in the past, it was an usual practice of the KCDC that Members would firstly comment on the background, objectives and results of the study and then the Secretariat would draft the invitation letter for tenders, which would also be sent to all consultancies, university research centres and other organisations on the department's list; (iii) she said that some members had quoted wrong information when discussing the paper. As Tuen Ma Line Phase 2 was expected to commission between August and October 2020, the relevant study would be completed by May 2020 instead of August to October. She wished that committee members could make full preparation before the meeting so that they could accord priority to livelihood affairs appropriately according to the actual needs of the community. She stated that Miss Alice CHOI, District Officer (Kowloon City) (DO(KC)), had remarked in the last KCDC meeting that the HAD would assume the gate-keeping responsibilities when approving funding. If Members considered that the funding had contravened the District Councils Ordinance, they could discuss with the DO(KC); and (iv) she said that the funding approval was procrastinated from December last year and the tenderers were already well-prepared. If the KCDC could not approve the funding for the study owing to a lack of time, it would be unfair to companies which had submitted tenders.

24. **Mr MA Hei-pang** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (i) he expressed strong regrets and disappointment over members' objection to the funding. He was also dissatisfied that some members did not consider much the interests of residents. He opined that senior members should understand that the commissioning of the new railway would bring great impact to the public transport in different districts;

(ii) he criticised that Mr HO Hin-ming did not prepare well for the meeting. He advised Mr HO to browse the KCDC website now and check whether the Secretariat had discharged its duties and uploaded the invitation letter for tenders; (iii) he pointed out that if Mr CHO Wui-hung questioned whether the funding complied with the District Councils Ordinance, he should present his justifications as well as elaborate which provision of the Ordinance the funding had breached and the details of the breach (iv) he commented that the tender exercise was conducted in an open and fair manner. Any companies capable of launching the study project could submit applications. Thus, he could not understand Mr YANG Wing-kit's accusation that the tendering procedures were unfair to some of the companies; and (v) he said that it was clearly specified in the invitation letter for tenders that the traffic demand assessment must be completed before the commissioning of Tuen Ma Line Phase 2. If the study was postponed to the next financial year, the initial target could not be met. Moreover, he was discontented that some members raised objections simply for the sake of doing so. They always blamed the KCDC for abusing the funding and making no contributions. He considered that their behaviors might result in the collapse of the district council.

25. **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** concurred with Mr MA Hei-pang's views that the study should be carried out as soon as possible. Since the tender exercise had already been conducted in a fair and open manner, he did not understand why some members questioned the fairness of the tender exercise at the current stage. If the opinions of the members were accepted and the funding was withdrawn, this would be unfair to the six companies which had sent representatives to attend today's meeting. In addition, he stated that the relevant study must be completed before the commissioning of Tuen Ma Line Phase 2 in order to achieve the greatest benefits. It would be too late if the study was re-tendered in the next financial year.

26. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** put forward the following views and enquiries: (i) in the first special meeting, though he did not listen to the presentations given by all companies, the first company clearly mentioned in its presentation that the study would be postponed to August. Thus, he questioned Dr KWONG Po-yin who remarked that the study would be completed by May; (ii) he reiterated that he had no objection to conducting the study but he pointed out that taking into account the time constraints and the pandemic, some companies decided not to submit tenders. If these companies learned that the study could be delayed, they might consider re-submitting tenders. Hence, the current practice was unfair to these companies; (iii) he pointed out that the tender invitation for the study ended on 4 December 2020 but the discussion on the tenders received only commenced in February 2021. He viewed that the funding

applications should be handled by circulation; (iv) this financial year was coming to a close. Even though funding was approved in this meeting, the successful tenderer could hardly launch and complete the study in the remaining days of March. If the company could ultimately complete the study as scheduled, still, there would only be a short run-up to the commissioning of Tuen Ma Line Phase 2 and hence significant improvement could not be made. If the report of the study was sent to the TD, the Department would need time to read; and (v) he stated that the entire application procedures did not make sense and individual members treated KCDC as an ATM machine. He was extremely dissatisfied with the paper and thus he would no longer participate in the discussion of the paper and walk out of the meeting in protest.

27. **The Vice-chairman** stated that the first special meeting was convened by the Chairman. The Chairman had explained at the time that since six companies had submitted tenders and the contents of the paper were rather complicated, he wished to call a special meeting so that committee members could have sufficient time to discuss the issue. He also decided to take a vote on whether to approve the funding for the study in today's meeting.

28. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he said that he had no objection to implementing the study but as funding was involved, the provisions set out in the Manual must be complied with. Otherwise, even if committee members endorsed the funding application, the funding would not be approved ultimately; (ii) he stated that he could not ascertain whether the allocation of funding for the study was consistent with the Manual and included in the terms of reference of a district council as stipulated in Section 61(b) of the District Councils Ordinance. He had enquired the Secretariat, the Chairman and other members about the issue many times but no replies were received; (iii) according to Article 97 of the Basic Law, district councils were organisations which were not organs of political power and one of their functions was to be consulted on district affairs. He asked whether this traffic study was implemented as per the Government's request, or upon the KCDC's consideration for the Government's advice. He was worried that the current practice would contravene Article 97 of the Basic Law; and (iv) if the aforesaid problem could not be addressed in today's meeting, he suggested discussing this agenda item further at the next meeting and conducting a vote only upon the provision of supplementary information by the Secretariat. He reiterated that he raised no objection to the study but as public funds were involved, the relevant provisions must be complied with. He did not wish to find that the study had violated the Basic Law or the Manual after Members' approval for the funding.

29. **Mr HO Hin-ming** stated that in the past, he was unable to attend some meetings in person and thus he did not understand some of the information and the situation. He pointed out that the objectives and contents of the study written in the project plan by tenderers should tie in with the requirements set out in the invitation letter for tenders. However, the objectives and contents of the study now written in each project plan varied. Thus, he enquired the Committee about the criteria for approving the project plan.

30. **Mr Melvin KAN, Assistant District Officer (Kowloon City) (ADO(KC))**, gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) the Government provided annual funding to district councils for implementation of the Community Involvement Project Subsidy Scheme to meet the needs of their districts. District councils' role was to offer advice on the relevant projects and examine funding applications to ensure that the use of funds would meet the needs of the districts and benefit most of the people in the community. In the meeting on 24 September, the TTC decided to approve an allocation of \$500,000 under the Community Involvement Project Subsidy Scheme for research purposes;
- (ii) moreover, according to Section 61(a)(iv) of the District Councils Ordinance, the functions of a district council included advising the Government on the use of public funds allocated to the district for local public works and community activities;
- (iii) to summarise, the allocation of funding for the study by the Committee was compatible with the functions of a district council set out in Section 61(a); and
- (iv) according to the Manual, a district council should offer advice on the use of funds before approving funding applications. It was also mentioned in Paragraph 23 of the the Notes on Application for the Kowloon City District Community Involvement Project Subsidy Scheme (the Notes) that "upon endorsement by the district council, the Director of Home Affairs (DHA) or any officer authorised by the DHA will approve the funding of the project if he/she is satisfied that the project falls within

the ambit and scope of DC funds.”

31. **Mr Pius YUM** voiced the following opinions: (i) he thanked Mr Melvin KAN, ADO(KC), for his detailed reply. However, he was disgruntled with the attitude of individual members; (ii) he pointed out that in the first special meeting, committee members had fully discussed the six project proposals and made enquiries with all tenderers. Yet, the performance of some tenderers was unsatisfactory. He believed that Members would make a decision based on their performance; (iii) he stated that the Kowloon City District Office (KCDO), instead of the KCDC, was responsible for inviting tenders for the study and sending invitation letters to consultancies selected by the TD. All tenderers had participated in the traffic study in the past. Hence, he did not understand why some members were still dissatisfied with the study; and (iv) he was of the view that some members tried to put off the study. He expressed disappointment over their objection to approving the funding for the study.

32. **Mr MA Hei-pang** aired the following views: (i) he pointed out that as traffic problems affected the livelihood of residents in the district, he supported approving funding for the study. He claimed that he acted with a clear conscience and was confident in explaining to residents the reasons for approving the funding; (ii) he said that the Committee wished to use public funds wisely. Thus, instead of approving the funding application by circulation, the Committee called a meeting and made detailed enquiries to all tenderers so that Members could observe their performance before making a decision; and (iii) he stated that some members remarked that even though the study report was completed, there would not be any changes to the traffic condition. He queried that the TD was liaising with the members concerned behind the doors. Though actual figures were provided in the study, the TD would not make any improvements.

33. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** put forward the following opinions and enquiries: (i) she said that according to the meeting minutes sent by the Secretariat at an earlier time, Mr HO Hin-ming had attended the fifth TTC meeting. Furthermore, Mr Melvin KAN, ADO(KC), had given an account in the sixth TTC meeting that in pursuant to the criteria for approving district council funds, the HAD had the right to perform its final gate-keeping role. Thus, the Secretariat had taken more time to send out invitation letters for tenders; (ii) she pointed out that incomprehensive traffic planning would seriously affect the livelihood of residents. She stated that after the commissioning of Kwun Tong Line Extension to Whampoa, the TD had significantly reduced the number of runs of buses and minibuses. Committee members were still discussing the impacts

of the changes today. She opined that the faulty planning on the traffic could be attributed to the fact that the KCDC could only conduct public consultation. In the absence of support by actual data, the department concerned might not listen to the opinions of residents. Hence, she hoped that the KCDC could approve funding for the study to avoid the recurrence of the traffic problems in Whampoa; (iii) she said that the traffic problems in Whampoa seriously impacted the livelihood of residents and caused inconvenience to residents in the district for many years. She viewed that some members displayed a lack of foresight and failed to identify problems in the district and make preparation, resulting in the continued deterioration of the problems; and (iv) she pointed out that the attachment to the paper was the supplementary information on the traffic study submitted by tenderers last time. Before approving the funding, committee members had the responsibility to read the paper carefully and raise questions about the reports and proposals submitted by tenderers in order to ensure that tenderers were capable of enhancing community involvement and bringing the greatest benefits to society, and the requirements of the Community Involvement Project Subsidy Scheme were met. She was dissatisfied that individual members who were absent from the last meeting kept on wasting the time of the Committee in this meeting.

34. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** stated that he did not wish to see that the HAD rejected the funding after the KCDC's approval. If so, he would request Mr Melvin KAN, ADO(KC), to attend the meeting and give an account on the situation by the time. Moreover, he said that Mr Melvin KAN, ADO(KC), only explained earlier that the funding complied with the Section 61 (a) of the District Councils Ordinance but did not make an reply on whether the study was consistent with the functions of a district council set out in Section 61(b).

35. **Mr HO Hin-ming** raised the following views and enquiries: (i) he stated that he had never voiced objection to conducting the study, and his only wish was to ensure an effective use of public funds. He enquired the criteria of the Committee for approving the allocation of \$500,000; (ii) he clarified that he could not attend the previous meeting out of personal reasons and his absence was approved by the Chairman; (iii) though all tenderers had explained in detail their project plans in the meeting, he viewed that when vetting the tenders, committee members must ensure that the research areas and requirements spelt out in the invitation letter for tenders were fully covered in the project plan submitted by the tenderers invited; (iv) he said that the successful tenderer must submit the study report on time and he asked whether the professional qualifications of tenderers were reviewed and verified; and (v) he strongly supported the study but he emphasised that the Committee must make follow-ups after

the completion of the study. He commented that zero improvement to the persistent traffic problems in Whampoa district was mainly due to the lack of follow-up actions by the Department. Thus, committee members should, at the same time, provide the Department advices on follow-up actions when submitting the study report.

36. **The Vice-chairman** responded that the KCDC had approved an allocation of \$500,000 to the TTC for research purposes according to the Standing Orders when endorsing the Budget last year.

37. **Mr Melvin KAN, ADO(KC)**, replied that the KCDO had no opinions on the funding application and they respected the suggestions offered by the KCDC on the use of funds for the Community Involvement Project Subsidy Scheme. In addition, the Manual had clearly specified that upon the approval of the district council, the Department would review whether the project fell within the ambit and scope of district council funds. Regarding the question on Section 61(b) of the District Councils Ordinance raised by members, he remarked that it was set out in Section 61(a)(iv) that the functions of a district council included advising the Government on the use of public funds allocated to the district. He held the view that the funding was to be allocated to the district for community activities and thus Section 61(b)(iii) was observed.

38. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary**, supplemented that the KCDC had approved the allocation of \$500,000 in the meeting on 15 October 2020. Thus, the TTC discussed the use of the provision in the subsequent meeting after 15 October 2020.

39. **The Vice-chairman** announced to conduct a vote on the tenders on a named basis and asked the Secretary about the voting procedures.

40. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary**, stated that since six companies had submitted tenders, she advised to vote on the tenders one by one. If two or more companies received the same number of votes, Members would vote on them again.

41. **The Vice-chairman** accepted the Secretary's advice and instructed the Secretary to record the voting results. The company receiving the highest number of votes would be awarded the tender. A vote was conducted on the application for an allocation of \$500,000 submitted by the Public Transport Research Team and the results were as follows:

Support : 0 vote

Objection : 0 vote

Abstention : 14 votes (Mr Joshua FUNG,
Dr KWONG Po-yin,
Dr KWAN Ka-lun,
Mr CHEUNG King-fan,
Mr Daniel WONG,
Mr TSANG Kin-chiu,
Miss CHAU Hei-man,
Mr WONG Wing-kit,
Miss Jakki MAK,
Mr Pius YUM,
Mr MA Hei-pang,
Mr YEUNG Chun-yu,
Mr LAI Kwong-wai and
Mr HO Hin-ming)

A vote was conducted on the application for an allocation of \$498,000 submitted by Meinhardt Infrastructure and Environment Limited and the results were as follows:

Support : 0 vote

Objection : 0 vote

Abstention : 14 votes (Mr Joshua FUNG,
Dr KWONG Po-yin,
Dr KWAN Ka-lun,
Mr CHEUNG King-fan,
Mr Daniel WONG,
Mr TSANG Kin-chiu,
Miss CHAU Hei-man,
Mr WONG Wing-kit,
Miss Jakki MAK,
Mr Pius YUM,
Mr MA Hei-pang,
Mr YEUNG Chun-yu,
Mr LAI Kwong-wai and

Mr HO Hin-ming)

A vote was conducted on the application for an allocation of \$500,000 submitted by Lok Fung (HK) Limited and the results were as follows:

Support	: 9 votes	(Dr KWONG Po-yin, Dr KWAN Ka-lun, Mr TSANG Kin-chiu, Miss CHAU Hei-man, Mr WONG Wing-kit, Miss Jakki MAK, Mr MA Hei-pang, Mr YEUNG Chun-yu and Mr LAI Kwong-wai)
Objection	: 0 vote	
Abstention	: 5 votes	(Mr Joshua FUNG, Mr CHEUNG King-fan, Mr Daniel WONG, Mr Pius YUM and Mr HO Hin-ming)

A vote was conducted on the application for an allocation of \$480,000 submitted by Skywalk Consultants Limited and the results were as follows:

Support	: 0 vote	
Objection	: 0 vote	
Abstention	: 14 votes	(Mr Joshua FUNG, Dr KWONG Po-yin, Dr KWAN Ka-lun, Mr CHEUNG King-fan, Mr Daniel WONG, Mr TSANG Kin-chiu, Miss CHAU Hei-man, Mr WONG Wing-kit,

Miss Jakki MAK,
 Mr Pius YUM,
 Mr MA Hei-pang,
 Mr YEUNG Chun-yu,
 Mr LAI Kwong-wai and
 Mr HO Hin-ming)

A vote was conducted on the application for an allocation of \$500,000 submitted by the Business, Economic and Public Policy Research Centre of the Hong Kong Shue Yan University and the results were as follows:

Support	: 1 vote	(Mr Daniel WONG)
Objection	: 0 vote	
Abstention	: 13 votes	(Mr Joshua FUNG, Dr KWONG Po-yin, Dr KWAN Ka-lun, Mr CHEUNG King-fan, Mr TSANG Kin-chiu, Miss CHAU Hei-man, Mr WONG Wing-kit, Miss Jakki MAK, Mr Pius YUM, Mr MA Hei-pang, Mr YEUNG Chun-yu, Mr LAI Kwong-wai and Mr HO Hin-ming)

A vote was conducted on the application for an allocation of \$488,000 submitted by Ho Wang SPB Limited and the results were as follows:

Support	: 2 votes	(Mr Pius YUM and Mr HO Hin-ming)
Objection	: 0 vote	
Abstention	: 12 votes	(Mr Joshua FUNG,

Dr KWONG Po-yin,
Dr KWAN Ka-lun,
Mr CHEUNG King-fan,
Mr Daniel WONG,
Mr TSANG Kin-chiu,
Miss CHAU Hei-man,
Mr WONG Wing-kit,
Miss Jakki MAK,
Mr MA Hei-pang,
Mr YEUNG Chun-yu
and Mr LAI Kwong-wai)

42. **The Vice-chairman** stated that since Lok Fung (HK) Limited received the highest number of votes from the members in attendance, Lok Fung (HK) Limited would thus be invited to conduct the traffic demand study and its funding application was approved.

43. **Mr HO Hin-ming** asked whether Lok Fung (HK) Limited was on the TD's list of consultants.

44. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary,** said that Lok Fung (HK) Limited was not on the TD's list of consultants.

45. **Mr HO Hin-ming** requested to put this issue into record.

New Items

Item 3

The Vetting and Approval of the Application for Implementing the Publicity Programme on Road and Cycling Safety in Kowloon City District (Paper No. 03/21)

46. **Mr HO Hin-ming** stated that many organisations were concerned about road and traffic safety in the district. He enquired whether the relevant department had sent invitation letters for the programme to different organisations or only uploaded the letter to the Department's website for public access.

47. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary,** replied that the invitation letter for

the activity had already been uploaded to the KCDC's website.

48. **Mr Pius YUM** declared that he had no interests related to this organisation. He pointed out that owing to the pandemic, many people ordered takeaway and therefore, many takeaway food couriers cycled on pavements or in urban areas. Thus, he wished that committee members could support the activity. Also, as many bicycle couriers were non-Asian, he suggested the organisation to provide publicity materials in English when holding the activity.

49. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** stated that one of the objectives of the activity was to improve the attitude of bicycle couriers and cyclers. She also suggested providing publicity materials in Urdu. Furthermore, she said that if the applicant organisation only promoted the activity on social media platforms, the promotional posts would soon be covered by new posts. Thus, she advised to add a new page on the KCDC's website to display the publicity materials or publications for activities funded or co-organised by the KCDC for the perusal of district council members and the public.

50. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** put forward the following opinions and enquiries: (i) this activity involved an allocation of \$300,000. He stated that in the past, the KCDC had never handled a publicity programme on traffic and road safety with an allocation amounting to as much as \$300,000; (ii) according to the information provided by the organisation, the activity aimed to "promote road and cycling safety through interactive online and offline activities in three stages, namely improving driving attitudes and techniques of cyclers, installing safety equipment on bicycles and creating a friendly environment in the community." He said that in the past, the KCDC had co-organised publicity programmes on traffic and road safety with professional groups such as the Kowloon City Division of the HKPF or the Kowloon City Road Safety Campaign Committee and the amount of funding involved was \$100,000 at most; (iii) he claimed that the applicant organisation appeared to be unprofessional as only one document for the activity was submitted for reference. Thus, he doubted the effectiveness of this publicity programme on traffic and road safety. Also, he viewed that it was cost-ineffective to allocate \$300,000 for holding an activity; and (vi) he suggested further discussing this agenda item at the next meeting and considering whether the application period had to be extended so that more organisations could submit applications and the Committee could make a proper decision and use public funds wisely.

51. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (i) the motion moved by Dr KWONG Po-yin at the meeting earlier was about the parking

problem of food delivery bicycles. However, the activity to be held by the applicant organisation was totally irrelevant with the requests in the motion as well as the contents and approaches of the research endorsed by the KCDC. He pointed out that the first stage of the activity, “installing safety equipment on bicycles”, was to hold online or offline workshops about the repair and maintenance of bicycles. The second stage, “improving driving attitudes and techniques”, was to show video clips, in an online or offline setting, in which Driver Ambassadors would educate the public on road safety. He considered that the problem of food delivery bicycles was not targeted at this item. The third stage of the activity, “creating a friendly environment in the community”, was to organise an online voting and the fourth cycling trip; (ii) the paper was totally irrelevant with the content and subject of the motion endorsed by the KCDC and thus he did not support approving the funding application; and (iii) he had no objection to holding the activity but he opined that the KCDC should invite tenders once again in order to look for another organisation more capable of holding educational activities against indiscriminate parking of food delivery bicycles.

52. **Mr CHEUNG King-fan** put forward the following views and enquiries: (i) only one application for the funding was received, with an appendix attached introducing the objectives and details of the activity including educating the public about the driving attitudes of cyclers and installing safety equipment on bicycles. He had observed the activity “Making on Loft” and visited the studio of the organisation, “Wheel Thing Makers”. He discovered that “Wheel Thing Makers” mainly held workshops and repaired or revamped old bicycles instead of teaching its members professional knowledge about traffic safety or driving attitudes; and (iii) he advised to conduct tendering once again so that more organisations could submit applications and committee members could have more applicants for selection.

53. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary**, answered the question whether publicity materials in other languages could be provided. She stated that since technical issues were involved, the Secretariat needed more time to explore the feasibility of doing so and would offer a reply to committee members later. In addition, she remarked that Members could make a decision on whether to extend the tender invitation period or further discuss this issue at the next meeting.

54. **The Vice-chairman** said that Members should decide on whether to approve the funding application for the publicity programme on road and cycling safety in Kowloon City District submitted by the applicant organisation. If committee members considered that the time was insufficient or they had doubts on the application,

they could vote against the application and further discuss whether to re-invite tenders or adopt other procedures.

55. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (i) the paper submitted by her at an earlier time aimed at not only addressing the problem of illegal parking of bicycles, but also enhancing the road safety awareness of cyclists in hope of stopping them from cycling on pavements or in the opposite direction of the traffic. She wished that the TD and the HKPF could organise activities to tackle the issue; (ii) the KCDC launched programmes on traffic safety every year. Since the programme on road safety was combined with that on cycling safety this year, the KCDC issued only one invitation letter for tenders for the entire programme; (iii) in the past, the KCDC mainly printed and distributed souvenirs to publicise road and traffic safety. This year, they intended to adopt a new approach and add the theme of community involvement into the programme; and (iv) to meet Members' every demand, they should no longer further discuss the agenda item, extend the application period nor revise the invitation letter for tenders upon voting. They could only submit new discussion papers to put forward their requests by the time. Thus, she suggested the Vice-chairman to consult Members' opinions on matters including whether to further discuss this issue or re-invite tenders.

56. **Mr HO Hin-ming** stated that according to the regulations of the Government Logistics Department, unless there were no other service providers in the market, the Government would never allocate funding to a single applicant and would instead conduct the tendering process again. In addition, he considered that the content of the teaching video submitted by the applicant organisation did not have too much to do with traffic safety and therefore, the organisation should supplement the relevant content by making a video about the safety guidelines and submit it to the TD and the Police for promotion and publicity.

57. **Mr SIU Leong-sing** concurred with the opinions of Dr KWONG Po-yin. He opined that the discussion of this agenda item could be continued as most of the DC Members considered that there were many points in the proposal that required elaboration and clarification. Also, he thought that the opinions in this meeting should be consolidated and submitted to the organisation so that amendments would be made with reference to the opinions of the KCDC, and then the matter could be discussed at the next meeting.

58. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** put forward the following views: (i) he agreed with Mr

HO Hin-ming. As the government funds involved amounted to \$300,000, it was unsatisfactory to have just one invitation for quotations or one proposal as the public might criticise the decision of the KCDC. Therefore, he was against taking a vote today; (ii) the proposed plan might not be able to improve cycling contraventions effectively. He opined that the Police and the TD should enhance law enforcement, education and road infrastructure improvement works in order to eradicate the problem at its source; and (iii) compared to unlawful cycling, the contraventions of electrical vehicle users posed greater risks to the public and needed to be addressed urgently. However, the work concerned should be referred to the relevant law enforcement agencies.

59. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** raised the following opinions: (i) if the content of the proposal submitted by the applicant organisation did not comply with the requirements of the KCDC, the Committee should reject the application instead of allocating the funding after the applicant made amendments to the proposal. He considered that such a practice would be unfair to other organisations and thus, he did not agree to continue the discussion of this agenda item; and (ii) he said that the motion moved by Dr KWONG Po-yin focused on the problems of cyclists delivering takeaways including parking illegally and driving in an opposite direction. However, the content of the proposal of the application was not related to the motion. He pointed out that the “Bicycle Repair Online Workshop” and the cycling tour had nothing to do with road safety. Even though the second phase “Driving Attitudes and Skills” was related to the content of the motion, the participation of the Police and the TD was required as the problem was related to enforcement issue. He stated that the study should put emphasis on how to improve the problem of illegal parking of bicycles, therefore, the allocation for this item should be rejected and quotations could be invited again after the quotation guidelines were clarified.

60. **Dr KWAN Ka-lun** remarked that this invitation was an open quotation and only one application was received. Hence, he requested the Secretariat to explain the procedures for open invitation for quotations and single invitation for quotations.

61. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary**, responded that the Secretariat had been adopting the practice of open invitation for quotations for all studies and activities. She supplemented that only one proposal was received before the deadline of this invitation for quotations and therefore, there was only one annex in the Paper.

62. **Mr TSANG Kin-chiu** stated that it had been clearly set out by the invitation

for proposal and the Secretary that the practice of open invitation for quotations were applied to the project, however, only one organisation submitted an application in the end. He opined that DC Members could put forward different expectations or opinions on this project, but they could not ensure that the applicant organisation could meet all the requirements.

63. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (i) she stated that most of the road safety activities organised by the TTC in the past entailed distribution of souvenirs. Although the Committee held parades before, what they did was merely renting tourist coaches; (ii) if the Committee decided to continue the discussion, she enquired whether the deadline could be extended to allow more interested organisations to submit applications for the KCDC to review; (iii) since the outbreak of the pandemic, she had submitted papers about bicycle safety for multiple times. However, the TD and the Police did not strengthen law enforcement and education work on bicycle safety and the problem concerned saw no improvement. Hence, she hoped that the public road security activities could be held every year so as to enhance public awareness on bicycle safety; and (iv) she enquired about the procedure of re-inviting quotations after the quotation was rejected and whether the KCDC would be unable to invite quotations for this activity again meanwhile because of the rejection. She also asked if the organisations whose applications were rejected could apply again after amending their proposals.

64. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary**, said that if the quotation was rejected, the KCDC could apply for an extension of the application period. If the DC Members decided to continue the discussion of this item, open invitation for quotations could be launched again or the application period could be extended before the next meeting of the TTC, and the matter could be discussed at the TTC meeting on 29 April. However, the committee members should consider if the schedule would be too tight.

65. **The Vice-chairman** suggested to decide whether to continue the discussion of this matter by voting as the committee members held different views on this matter.

66. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** requested the Secretariat to clarify the procedures and the ways of handling. As the re-invitation of quotations involved different procedures, the Council must first decide if the application of the organisation should be approved, and then decide if they would re-invite quotations.

67. **Mr HO Hin-ming** said that the document submitted by the only applicant

failed to comply with the requirements of the KCDC. If the discussion continued, the Council could not change the content of the invitation and could only talk about the original document. If the organisation was allowed to make amendments on their proposal, it would be unfair to the organisations which did not submit applications. Therefore, he advised to first reject the quotation, and then invite quotations again. It would only be fair to let other organisations or the organisation concerned amend the proposals and submit the application again, and then Members discussed the matter further at the next meeting.

68. **Dr KWAN Ka-lun** suggested to adjourn the meeting for 15 minutes so that the Secretariat could discuss the procedure for reaching a decision.

69. **Miss CHAU Hei-man** concurred with Dr KWAN Ka-lun's suggestion about the adjournment.

70. **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** enquired whether there was a breach of provisions of the Manual in approving the funding when there was only one application violating the provisions.

71. **The Vice-chairman** said that the Secretariat needed time to prepare the answer to the above question and so announced to adjourn the meeting for ten minutes.

(Adjournment for 10 Minutes)

72. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary**, replied that if the quotation was rejected by the committee members at this meeting, the whole Paper would be rejected as well. According to the procedure, the invitation for quotations could only be issued after the Paper was re-submitted in the next meeting and discussed by the committee members. As no approved but unused provision was available for holding the activity concerned in the budget for this financial year, if the quotation was rejected, the activity concerned would be listed as activities held in the new financial year. The result of the new invitation for quotations would be available in the meeting of the TTC on 17 June the earliest.

73. **The Vice-chairman** announced to vote on the approval of the Wheel Thing Makers Creative Society's application for implementing the publicity programme on road and cycling safety in Kowloon City District, and the results were as follows:

- Support : 0 vote
- Objection : 8 votes (Dr KWONG Po-yin, Dr KWAN Ka-lun, Mr KWOK Tin-lap, Mr Daniel WONG, Mr Pius YUM, Mr MA Hei-pang, Mr SIU Leong-sing and Mr YEUNG Chun-yu)
- Abstention : 6 votes (Mr Joshua FUNG, Mr TSANG Kin-chiu, Miss CHAU Hei-man, Mr WONG Wing-kit, Miss Jakki MAK and Mr LAI Kwong-wai)

74. **The Vice-chairman** announced that the application was not approved. If further discussion was required, the committee members could submit papers at the next meeting.

75. **Mr Pius YUM** stated that even though the Paper was rejected at this meeting, he agreed with the committee members, who opined that the Police and the TD should follow up on the road safety problems of bicycles. He noted that the Police had conducted the relevant work but he still saw cyclists riding on pavements. He considered that no stringent enforcement actions were taken by the Department and hoped that they could look into the problem concerned by the committee members.

76. **The Vice-chairman** urged the Police and the TD to pay attention to the opinions concerned and enhance the relevant works.

Item 4

Bus Route Planning Programme 2021-2022 of Kowloon City District (Paper No. 04/21)

77. **Mr Michael MAN, Senior Transport Officer / Bus / Kowloon of the TD,** presented Paper No. 04/21.

78. **Mr MA Hei-pang** explained that as some vehicles from Route 6C was allocated for use on Route 6X, the frequency of runs on Route 6C was reduced. He enquired the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (KMB) whether the vehicles from Route 6C would be allocated to the new Route X6C in the future.

79. **Mr YEUNG Chun-yu** raised the following opinions: (i) he opined that the current routing of Route 5D failed to serve users effectively. He also asked whether the KMB had worked with the TD to look into the feasibility of diverting Route 5D to ply Shing Kai Road so that the residents of Kai Tak and To Kwa Wan could travel to and from Kai Tak MTR Station with ease; and (ii) he agreed that the existing resources of Route 22M should be better utilised in order to strengthen the service. However, he opined that there was an overlapping of routes at the section where a U-turn was made at San Lau Street to travel to Ma Tau Wai Road and Ma Tau Chung Road in the circular Route 22M. He advised to divert the route to To Kwa Wan Road (i.e. To Kwa Wan (Lower Section)) so that more residents of To Kwa Wan could travel to Kai Tak MTR Station and the nearby area of Kai Tak Development, the children's hospital and the cruise terminal via this route.

80. **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** enquired whether the KMB would allocate the vehicles from Route 6C to run on Route X6C. In addition, airport bus Route A23 would be diverted to complement the new Route A25. He asked the Citybus Limited / New World First Bus Services Limited (Citybus) if the frequency of runs on Route A23 had to be reduced as vehicles had to be allocated to run on Route A25.

81. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** held the following opinions and enquiries: (i) he remarked that many residents of To Kwa Wan district would take Route 6C. Although he welcomed the provision of Route X6C by the KMB, he was worried that the patronage of Route 6C would reduce because of the introduction of a new route, which led to a cut in the frequency of runs on Route 6C by the KMB. He requested the KMB to provide new routes on the premises that the original service could be maintained; and (ii) he welcomed the provision of Route A25. He also pointed out that there were six vehicles running on Route A23 originally but there were only five vehicles on the new Route A25. As Route A23 would not pass by the area of To Kwa Wan and Hung Hom in the future and the route concerned would be taken over by Route A25, he enquired whether the service level of Route A25 could be maintained by six vehicles.

82. **Mr Michael MAN of the TD** consolidated his response as follows:

- (i) he expressed that the KMB would deploy two more double-decker buses to run on Route X6C instead of allocating vehicles from Route 6C;
- (ii) he noted the proposal of the committee members for altering the

routing of Route 5D and 22M in To Kwa Wan. The Department would make adjustments to a series of bus routes in the future in accordance with the major developments in Kai Tak District, especially the construction progress of the residential buildings along Shing Kai Road. The TD would also consult the views of the committee members later on; and

- (iii) regarding the frequency arrangement for Route A25 and A23, the interval of both routes was one run per 30 minutes.

83. **Mr Luka LAI, Senior Operation Support Officer of the KMB**, replied that the KMB would allocate two additional vehicles to run on Route X6C and thus, the frequency of runs on Route 6C would remain unchanged. He also agreed with the committee members' proposal for diverting Route 5D to ply Shing Kai Road and had reflected the proposal to the TD via different channels, however, it would take time to discuss the details of the changes in the routing with the Department.

84. **Mr Simon WONG, Planning and Scheduling Manager of the Citybus**, consolidated his reply as follows:

- (i) he noted the suggestion of diverting Route 22M to To Kwa Wan (Lower Section) and would discuss afresh the relevant matter with the TD;
- (ii) the Citybus would deploy five buses to run on Route A25 and these buses would not be allocated from Route A23; and
- (iii) as the travel distance of Route A25 was shorter than that of Route A23, only five vehicles were required to maintain the current service level of Route A23 and provide one run per 30 minutes.

85. **Mr HO Hin-ming** put forward the following views and enquiries: (i) in the past, only Route E22 would ply Chuk Yuen Road and Junction Road, therefore, he was satisfied with the change in the routing of Route A23; (ii) as the "E" route airport buses had to go around the airport supporting area before arriving at the airport, he considered that the route arrangement was a waste of fuel and time. He suggested that the "E" route buses should first go to the airport and short-haul buses should be provided to connect various locations with the airport supporting area; (iii) as Route E22 was often

full during commuting hours, residents were unable to take Route E22 to the airport in the morning. Hence, he hoped that the situation could be improved after the diversion of Route A23; and (iv) he advised the TD and the bus companies to study the impact of the commissioning of Tuen Ma Line (TML) Phase 2 on the bus routes.

86. **Dr KWAN Ka-lun** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (i) he asked about the estimated amount of people affected by the diversion of Route 30X; (ii) he advised to make reference to the practice adopted in Tuen Mun District and use Route 30 as a pilot route to study the feasibility of providing two-way section fares; (iii) although the passenger volume of Route 115P dropped due to the commissioning of Hung Hom to Central ferry service, he still hoped that the KMB could monitor the data on a regular basis in future so as to review the need of reopening the route.

87. **Mr HE Huahan** voiced the following views and enquiries: (i) he pointed out that there was only one vehicle serving Route 608P and 20A respectively during peak hours which could not meet passengers' demand. He suggested to make reference to the practice used for the bus route running in Cheung Sha Wan and deploy at least three vehicles during peak hours; (ii) he was against the suggestion about extending Route 22M to To Kwa Wan because its routing already overlapped with that of Route 108, 107 and 5A. As many students could not get onto buses of Route 20 during peak hours, he advised to extend the routing of Route 22M to the area around the Festival Walk in Kowloon Tong; (iii) he thanked the suggestion by the Citybus about the introduction of a new route which could arrive at Cheung Sha Wan. As Route 22 could not reach Mei Foo, he hoped that the Citybus could consider setting the terminal of the new route at Mei Foo; (iv) he did not support any alteration to Route A23 by the Citybus because it was the only bus route for residents in Kai Tak to travel to Tsz Wan Shan. As the school places in Kai Tak District were not enough to meet the demand, most of the students were assigned to schools in the Wong Tai Sin and Tsz Wan Shan area and they had to take Route A23 to commute to and from schools. If the bus runs on the route were reduced, students would have to endure great inconvenience when travelling to and from schools; (v) the Department and the bus companies had stated that they would provide a route from Fanling to Kai Tak in the bus route rationalisation plan last year. However, the suggestion was scrapped in the end. He enquired whether the route had been cancelled; (vi) he concurred with Mr YEUNG Chun-yu's suggestion about altering the routing of Route 5D. He commented that the frequency of Route 5D was one run per 30 minutes and as it had to pass by San Po Kong, passengers opted other transport alternatives due to the circuitousness of its route. He wished that the bus route rationalisation plan this year could adjust the routing of Route 5D so that it would

pass by Road D2 in Kai Tak. He expressed that there was a serious problem of illegal parking of dump trucks in Road D2 as it was under-utilised and was only used by Route 608; and (vii) the KMB had stated that they would not consider changing the route of Route 5D as it would affect the original passengers. However, he said that the change concerned would only affect one of the bus stops in Mok Cheong Street while other bus stops could be reached by taking Route 5A, 108 and 107. He suggested the KMB to ask Mr YEUNG Chun-yu about the daily usage of the bus stop concerned in Mok Cheong Street and reconsider the relevant suggestion based on the data.

88. **Mr CHEUNG King-fan** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (i) the population of Kai Tak District would increase as the intake for the housing estates in the district gradually commenced. According to the alteration proposed, the interval of Route 20A could change to one run every 15 to 20 minutes. However, there were no runs between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. and only the two special runs on 6:50 a.m. and 6:15 p.m. would pass by Muk On Street and Muk Tai Street. Thus he hoped that additional runs would be arranged to travel past the abovementioned streets; (ii) even though the runs of Route 22M were increased, the population in Muk Tai Street would continue to rise in future. Hence, he advised the Citybus to consider diverting the route to ply the area of Muk Tai Street; and (iii) he remarked that Route A23 would not pass through Kai Tak and Route A25 would take its place in serving the district. To facilitate the use of Route A25 by children and elders, he suggested to set its terminal at Muk On Street and make the route go past Kai Ching Estate before heading to To Kwa Wan. He opined that the change could benefit more Kai Tak residents as the route would wind through Kai Ching Estate, Tak Long Estate, Muk On Street and Muk Tai Street.

89. **Mr Michael MAN of the TD** consolidated his response as follows:

- (i) he noted the committee members' opinions on Route A23 and A25 and remarked that Route A23 was originally designed as an airport bus route. He understood that students living in Kai Tak District needed to go to schools in Tsz Wan Shan and therefore, the Department would discuss with bus companies later to consider strengthening the services of other bus routes that travelled between Kai Tak District and Tsz Wan Shan such as Route 15A;
- (ii) regarding the suggestion of revising the routing of Route 20A, 22M and A25 to go past Muk Tai Street and Muk On Street, he replied that

bus stops would be provided in the area of Shing Kai Road near Muk Tai Street, which would be opened this year as well. The Department would review the situation after Muk Tai Street was opened to adjust the relevant bus routes;

- (iii) he noted the committee members' suggestion of the routing of Route 5D. The Department would adjust the relevant bus routes in the future according to the development of Kai Tak District, and would consult the committee members before making any changes;
- (iv) regarding the change of its terminal from Cheung Sha Wan to Mei Foo, he explained that the purpose of providing the route was to connect the business areas in Sham Shui Po, Cheung Sha Wan and Lai Chi Kok with the major development projects in Kai Tak, Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. He noted the committee members' opinion about extending the route to the terminus at Mei Foo, however, he had to consult other District Councils on the suggestion; and
- (v) the construction of the route connecting Kai Tak and Fanling was one of the projects last year and he had to check the information before making a reply.

90. **Mr Simon WONG of the Citybus** consolidated his response as follows:

- (i) regarding the frequency of Route 608P, he advised to provide an additional run during the peak hour in the morning. The Citybus would closely monitor its patronage and enhance the service of the route when necessary;
- (ii) concerning the suggestion of extending Route 22M to the Festival Walk, he said that Route 22 could arrive at the Festival Walk but the route could still carry more passengers. As there was only Route 608 providing uni-directional service between Kai Tak and To Kwa Wan at the moment, he suggested to divert Route 22M to ply the area around San Lau Street in order to make up for the lack of vehicles travelling between To Kwa Wan and Kai Tak and strengthen the bus services between the two areas. In addition, he noted the suggestion

of the committee members about diverting 22M to pass through Muk Tai Street and would discuss the feasibility of the suggestion concerned with the TD;

- (iii) as for the service hours of Route 20A and the arrangement of having only one run per day that travelled to Muk Tai Street and Muk On Street, he said that he would discuss the feasibility of the suggestion with the TD so as to enhance the service hours and area of the route concerned; and
- (iv) he would talk to the TD about the feasibility of changing the starting point of Route A23 to Muk On Street so as to shorten the walking distance of residents from the airport to the bus stop.

91. **Mr Luka LAI of the KMB** gave a reply as follows:

- (i) as the bus routes in Tuen Mun and Yuen Long were mainly long haul, their fares were more expensive than those running in other areas and thus, the KMB decided to implement two-way section fares in these two districts first on a pilot basis. As for routes that provided services to other areas in the urban area, the KMB would conduct a district-by-district study to see whether two-way section fares could be offered. He noted the views of the committee members and would carry out a review in detail;
- (ii) since the route of Route 30X from Tsuen Wan to Whampoa was diverted to ply Yeung Uk Road, two bus stops had to be changed as the statistics showed that the usage of the two bus stops was less than 5% of the total patronage of the route; and
- (iii) he reiterated that the KMB supported the proposal of diverting Route 5D to ply Shing Kai Road.

92. **Mr KWOK Tin-lap** put forward the following opinions: (i) he said that he had assessed the passenger volume of Route 115P on Saturday and the result was around 22% (30 people on a bus with a passenger capacity of 137). Therefore, he queried about the accuracy of the 15% passenger volume as stated by the KMB. As there were

very few bus routes passing by the Laguna Verde, any reduction of service would lead the Laguna Verde become isolated; (ii) he understood that the patronage of the route on Saturday was not high after the commissioning of Central to Hung Hom ferry service, residents of the Laguna Verde still had to spend a lot of time walking to the area around Hung Hom Pier and Whampoa MTR Station before taking other transportation to Central. He was dissatisfied that the KMB reduced the frequency of Route 115P and opined that the KMB could consider other plans, such as cutting down the runs on Saturday to one or using single-decker buses instead so as to meet the patronage requirement of 30% as set out by the KMB; and (iii) he supported the arrangement of Route A25 and considered that the route could relieve the situation where buses of Route A23 were already full when they arrived at the Laguna Verde.

93. **Mr NG Po-keung** pointed out that the transportation from Lung Shing Old District to Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing was very inconvenient. Residents had to take a bus to Mei Foo and make interchanges and it would take a lot of time to wait for a bus during peak hours. Therefore, he advised to introduce new routes in Lung Shing Old District which went pass To Kwa Wan and travel to Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing in order to bring convenience to the residents. Although the mobile application could now display the bus arrival time, he suggested to install estimated bus arrival display panels at more bus stops in view that elders might not know how to use smartphones, and also residents could be benefitted from it when waiting for buses.

94. **Mr Pius YUM** held the following views and enquiries: (i) he expressed that it was very inconvenient when inputting Route X6C in the KMB mobile application and thus, he advised the Department or the KMB to consider changing the name of the route; and (ii) the current fare of Route 6C was \$5.8 but the fare of Route X6C would be adjusted to \$6.8. He enquired if Route X6C would provide section fares in Kowloon City District like Route 6C. He opined that only passengers who could enjoy the \$2 concessionary fare would take the route if the fare of Route X6C was \$6.8.

95. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (i) he stated that the addition of two stops in the newly introduced Route E21A would lead to a prolonged journey time. Also, additional stops which provided convenience to residents of Ho Man Tin and Tung Chung when going to the airport had yet to be provided along the route travelling to and from the airport even though it was requested

by the DC Members; (ii) as for the service hour, even though the departure time of Route E21A from Oi Man Estate was advanced to 7:30 a.m., it was still later than the departure time in Tung Chung. He suggested that the time of the first bus departing from Oi Man Estate should be advanced 15 minutes to 7:15 a.m.; (iii) as the fare from Tung Chung to Ho Man Tin remained to be \$14, he advised to provide section fares earlier so as to alleviate the financial burden of residents; and (iv) he enquired whether an extra vehicle could be allocated to the route to shorten the bus waiting time as it had nine vehicles originally.

96. **Mr Michael MAN of the TD** gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (i) taking consideration of the continuous and massive growth in the future population of Kai Tak, the Department was worried that the extension of Route A23 would make it difficult for residents of Kowloon City District, especially in the area of To Kwa Wan and Whampoa, to take airport buses. In view of this, the Department introduced Route A25 which departed from Kowloon City District. He thanked the committee members' suggestions on Route A25;
- (ii) regarding the DC Members' opinions about Route 115P, the Department had also conducted surveys on their own apart from making reference to the patronage statistics provided by the KMB. The Department had sent staff to take two buses of Route 115P on 20 February (Saturday) and found that there were only around 30 passengers taking the two runs, which showed that the patronage of the route on Saturday was low. To achieve better use of resources for buses, the Department advised to cancel the service of this route on Saturday. He suggested that the passengers in Laguna Verde and Whampoa to be affected could walk for a few minutes to Whampoa Bus Terminus and take Route 115; and
- (iii) he noted the committee members' suggestion about the provision of a new bus route travelling from Kowloon City District to Tsuen Wan or Kwai Tsing. The Department would also review the patronage of the route concerned after the commissioning of TML Phase 2 and study the feasibility of the suggestion.

97. **Mr Luka LAI of the KMB** noted the DC Members suggestion about Route X6C and the establishment of section fares, and would conduct a review again after collecting the views on the route from other district. Also, he remarked that Route X6C was named as such because most road sections it plied were similar to that of Route 6C. He remained open-minded on the naming of the route and if the DC Members had better suggestions, they were welcomed to bring them up for discussion.

98. **Mr Simon WONG of the Citybus** said that the Citybus had already reserved vehicles to enhance the service of Route E21A, and would carefully consider to advance the time of the first bus departed from Ho Man Tin accordingly.

99. **Miss CHAU Hei-man** remarked that when the TD was answering the committee members' enquiries, they had stated for multiple times that bus routes would be adjusted in accordance with the intake of the new flats around Kai Tak. Since the opening of Kai Tak MTR Station last year, the constructions of multiple Home Ownership Scheme flats and private buildings were completed in Kai Tak, yet the adjustment of bus routes was not observed at the moment. She pointed out that it would still take a few years for all new property developments in Kai Tak to be occupied. She also asked why the Department failed to respond to the re-routing proposals suggested by the DC Members or the bus companies for multiple times.

100. **Mr LAM Tak-shing** put forward the following views: (i) in response to the KMB's advice of inviting the DC Members to suggest a route number, he said that Route X6C could be renamed as Route 6CX. In addition, considering the number of residents who complained about the inaccurate time of arrival of Route 6C buses, he hoped that the KMB could review the estimated time of arrival in the application and the actual time of arrival of the vehicle regularly to ensure that the runs arrived at bus stops on time; (ii) as many residents in the Kowloon City District would take Route 30X to go to the area around Nina Tower, he asked how much journey time would be saved after the diversion of Route 30X. The Department also suggested to change the routing of Route 30X to pass by Yeung Uk Road, Texaco Road and Tsuen Wan Interchange in order to save journey time. However, he was worried that residents might not be able to get used to the new route. He advised the Department to collect residents' views first, and then study the diversion arrangement; and (iii) during the pandemic, the runs of the "A" route airport buses became unstable and some bus stops were temporarily suspended. Therefore, he requested the Citybus to notify residents about the relevant arrangements in advance in future.

101. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** raised the following opinions and enquiries: (i) she said that since the cancellation of Route 212 by the KMB, no bus routes travelling to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were provided and most of the passengers could not enjoy concessionary fares when taking the public transport. She hoped that the KMB could consider implementing section fare arrangement on Route 30X for an effective use of vehicle resources; (ii) she enquired about the actual number of passengers affected by the diversion of Route 30X. Also, the bus stops at Nina Tower and Clague Garden Estate would be cancelled according to the current suggestion. The Department advised the passengers affected to interchange with Route 234X or MTR to go to Tsim Sha Tsui and Hung Hom. However, she opined that the routing of Route 234X was not the best replacement as Route 6X would no longer pass through Tsim Sha Tsui and the frequency of Route 6 was reduced. She suggested that the Department and the KMB should collect passengers' opinions before proposing a route diversion; and (iii) she understood that Route 115P had to be cancelled due to the reduced patronage. To bring convenience to the residents, she advised to make reference to the practice of Route 13X and deploy two special runs on Saturday mornings which passed by Laguna Verde before heading to Whampoa. In doing so, the journey time would not increase significantly and the residents of Laguna Verde could commute with ease.

102. **Miss Jakki MAK** said that the Citybus had replied that they had already reserved vehicles and would advance the time of the first bus of Route E21 from Oi Man Estate at an appropriate time. She enquired about the criteria and definition of an appropriate time, and the earliest time of the advancing the departure time.

103. **Mr Michael MAN of the TD** consolidated his reply as follows:

- (i) the Department noted the committee members' opinions on different bus routes in Kai Tak District, and would make reference to the opinions and consider their suggestions when planning the development direction of bus routes in Kai Tak District in the future; and
- (ii) regarding the suggestion of deploying vehicles of Route 115 to run special runs and pass by Laguna Verde, he said that the Department would study the feasibility of the suggestion concerned with the KMB in respect of the journey time and resource allocation.

104. **Mr Luka LAI of the KMB** gave a consolidated response as follows:
- (i) he noted the DC Members' suggestion of renaming Route X6C as Route 6CX and would consider the matter after consulting other District Councils. He hoped that they could come up with a more suitable choice which was easy to input and identified;
 - (ii) after the routing of Route 30X heading to Whampoa was diverted to ply Yeung Uk Road, it was expected that the journey time could be reduced by three to five minutes. As the traffic at the road sections around Nina Tower was relatively busier, the journey time became unstable due to the frequent traffic congestion. Therefore, he advised to alter the route to avoid passing road sections around Nina Tower and provide a bus stop at Yeung Uk Road Market to facilitate citizens walking from Yeung Uk Road to Nina Tower Bus Terminus; and
 - (iii) he noted the committee members' request of offering two-way section fares for Route 30X and would evaluate if section fares could be provided in Kowloon City District.

105. **Mr Simon WONG of the Citybus** replied that the occupancy rate of Route E21A buses during the busiest hour of the day was approximately 60%. The Citybus would pay close attention to the passenger volume and would consider increasing its frequency if there was a rise in passenger number.

106. **Mr LAI Kwong-wai** remarked that TML Phase 2 would be commissioned this year. After the commissioning of the Kwun Tong Line Extension started operation, the Department had submitted a public transport reorganisation plan about the arrangement after the commissioning of the new railway line to KCDC for consultation. He asked the Department the expected date to submit the public transport reorganisation plan about the arrangement after the commissioning of TML Phase 2 for consultation.

107. **Mr Pius YUM** stated that the current routing of Route 15A travelling from Richland Gardens to the Kowloon Bay Business Area was already circuitous, therefore, he advised the Department not to alter the route again.

108. **Mr Michael MAN of the TD** consolidated his reply as follows:
- (i) as the commissioning date of TML Phase 2 was not confirmed yet, the committee members would be notified once updates were available. The Department would definitely submit documents to the KCDC for consultation;
 - (ii) the route travelling from Fanling to Kai Tak brought up by the committee members earlier on had been confirmed last year. However, it was not provided for the time being as the Department had to observe the development of the area around Queen's Hill at the moment; and
 - (iii) he noted the opinions of the committee members on Route 15A. The Department would make further consideration in respect of the passenger volume, the journey time and the use of bus resources.

Item 5

Strong Request for Providing Priority Seats and Real-time Bus Arrival Information Display Panels at the Bus Stop off the Civil Engineering and Development Department in Chung Man Street (Paper No. 05/21)

109. Paper No. 05/21 was submitted by **Mr CHO Wui-hung**, the Vice-chairman invited the committee members to refer to the written reply from the TD, i.e. Document No. 11 tabled.

110. **Mr CHO Wui-hung** presented Paper No. 05/21.

111. **The Vice-chairman** said that as there were only 12 committee members present at the moment and the quorum was not reached, the meeting had to be adjourned. He instructed the Secretary to ask the DC Members who had left the conference room to return as soon as possible.

(Adjournment for 15 Minutes)

112. **The Vice-chairman** said that there were still only 12 committee members present at the meeting room and the quorum of 13 people was not reached, therefore,

he announced to adjourn the meeting. As most of the agenda items were attached with written replies, he asked the committee members if there were any items that required further discussion.

113. **Mr CHEUNG King-fan** requested to continue the discussion of item 7 “‘Multi-modal’ Environmentally Friendly Linkage System”.

114. **Miss Charmaine LEE, the Secretary** said that the Secretariat had already enquired the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) in respect of item 7, but the Department replied that they would only provide a written reply without sending representatives to attend the meeting. The committee members could decide whether the discussion of the item concerned should be continued if necessary.

115. **Dr KWONG Po-yin** asked if the speeches made at the moment would be recorded in the minutes. If not, she advised to continue the discussion of the matter as the CEDD would not send representatives to attend the meeting. If the Department would send representatives, then it might not be necessary to continue the discussion. In addition, she had already contacted the TD to conduct a site visit together in order to address the problems mentioned in the Paper submitted. She asked if she could request for further discussion if problems were identified during the site visit. She was also worried that if the problems concerned could not be solved, she would have to wait for half year to ask for follow-ups at the meeting.

116. **Mr YANG Wing-kit** suggested that after the meeting was terminated, the undiscussed agenda item would automatically be moved to the next meeting for further discussion and thus, it was unnecessary to discuss whether the discussion of the remaining agenda items should be continued.

117. **The Vice-chairman** stated that the discussion of the remaining agenda items would be continued at the next meeting and announced that the meeting was adjourned.

Any Other Business

Date of Next Meeting

118. **The Vice-chairman** declared that the next meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 29 April 2021 (Thursday) and the deadline for submission of papers was 14 April 2021. There being no other business, the Vice-chairman declared that the meeting was adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

119. The minutes of this meeting were confirmed on 2021.

Chairman

Secretary

Kowloon City District Council Secretariat
June 2021