

Sha Tin District Council**Minutes of the Special Meeting of
the Traffic and Transport Committee in 2016**

Date : 27 April 2016 (Wednesday)
Time : 2:30 pm
Venue : Sha Tin District Council Conference Room
 4/F, Sha Tin Government Offices

<u>Present</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Time of joining the meeting</u>	<u>Time of leaving the meeting</u>
Mr LI Sai-wing (Chairman)	DC Member	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael (Vice-Chairman)	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr HO Hau-cheung, BBS, MH	DC Chairman	2:34 pm	5:21 pm
Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas, SBS, JP	DC Vice-Chairman	2:34 pm	4:46 pm
Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung	DC Member	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Ms CHAN Man-kuen	"	2:34 pm	5:32 pm
Mr CHAN Nok-hang	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr CHING Cheung-ying, MH	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Sunny	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr CHIU Man-leong	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr HUI Yui-yu, Rick	"	2:34 pm	4:25 pm
Mr LAI Tsz-yan	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Ms LAM Chung-yan	"	3:00 pm	5:30 pm
Mr LI Sai-hung	"	4:24 pm	5:49 pm
Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr MOK Kam-kwai, BBS	"	2:40 pm	3:25 pm
Mr NG Kam-hung	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Ms PONG Scarlett Oi-lan, JP	"	2:34 pm	4:40 pm
Mr SIU Hin-hong	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr TING Tsz-yuen	"	2:34 pm	4:00 pm
Mr TONG Hok-leung	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Ms TSANG So-lai	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Ms TUNG Kin-lei	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr WAI Hing-cheung	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger	"	2:34 pm	5:36 pm
Mr WONG Hok-lai	"	2:39 pm	6:10 pm
Ms WONG Ping-fan, Iris	"	2:34 pm	3:00 pm
Mr WONG Yue-hon	"	2:34 pm	3:30 pm
Mr YAU Man-chun	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Mr YIU Ka-chun	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Ms YUE Shin-man	"	2:34 pm	6:10 pm
Ms CHAN Cheuk-lee, Cherry (Secretary)	Executive Officer (District Council) 4, Sha Tin District Office		

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Title</u>
Mr WONG Tin-pui, Simon	Assistant District Officer (Sha Tin)
Mr YUEN Chun-kit, Derek	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Sha Tin District Office

In Attendance

Ms LIU Ching-man, Lisa
 Mr YAU Kung-yuen, Corwin
 Mr Ingmar LEE

Mr Brian CHEUNG

Ms Amanda HUNG
 Ms LEE Ching-ling

Title

Senior Transport Officer (Sha Tin), Transport Department
 Senior Transport Officer (Ma On Shan), Transport Department
 Senior Planning & Development Officer,
 The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
 Manager, Community Affairs,
 The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
 Senior Operations Officer, The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
 Public Affairs Officer/New World First Bus Services Limited/Citybus Limited

In Attendance by Invitation

Mr LUK Fong-tin, Alex
 Mr LAM Sai-shu

Mr Chris LO

Mr Simon WONG

Mr Pedro Pang

Mr Rayson LAW

Title

Senior Transport Officer/Bus/NTE/Transport Department
 Assistant Manager (Operations),
 The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
 Senior Operations Officer,
 The Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited
 Planning and Scheduling Manager,
 New World First Bus Services Limited/Citybus Limited
 Assistant Planning Officer,
 New World First Bus Services Limited/Citybus Limited
 Planning and Support Officer I, Long Win Bus Company

Absent

Mr LEUNG Ka-fai, Victor
 Mr MAK Yun-pui
 Mr PUN Kwok-shan, MH
 Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, James
 Mr CHENG Tsuk-man
 Mr LEE Chi-Wing, Alvin
 Mr WONG Ka-wing, MH
 Mr YIP Wing

Title

DC Member (Application for leave of absence received)
 ” (”)
 ” (”)
 ” ((No application for leave of absence received)
 ” (”)
 ” (”)
 ” (”)
 ” (”)

Action

The Chairman informed all attendees that some members of the public, being present as observers, were taking photos and making video and audio recordings.

Application for Leave of Absence

2. The Chairman said that the Secretariat received the applications for leave of absence in writing from the following members:

Mr LEUNG Ka-fai, Victor	Official Commitment
Mr MAK Yun-pui	”
Mr PUN Kwok-shan	Duty visit on the development of Mainland China

3. The Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) approved the applications for leave of absence submitted by the above members.

Matters Arising

Response of Government Departments and Organisations to Matters Arising from the Previous Meeting

(Paper No. TT 17/2016)

4. The views of Mr TONG Hok-leung were summarised below:

- (a) he asked about the progress on the review of Route No. 82B, and how and when to increase its frequency; and
- (b) the proposal on Routes Nos. 80A, 82K, 286X and E42 might slightly improve the transport in Tai Wai. However, in the long run, the bus frequency should be increased and more airport shuttle bus services (via Tai Wai) should be introduced.

5. According to Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger, bus fares from Sha Tin to Hong Kong Island were expensive without fare concessions for cross-company interchanging passengers, and Route No. 281A was circuitous, but the fare charged for passengers interchanging at City One Sha Tin towards Kwong Yuen and Kwong Hong was \$5. So, the situation needed improvement.

6. The views of Mr WONG Yue-hon were summarised below:

- (a) he asked if the Transport Department (TD) and the bus companies would adopt the suggestion to re-route Route No. 48P to depart from Fo Tan; and
- (b) he was pleased to see an increase in the frequency of Route No. 88X and asked about the reason why the proposal to extend its terminus to Fo Tan still had not been implemented.

7. The views of Ms WONG Ping-fan, Iris were summarised below:

- (a) she hoped the TD and the bus companies would give consideration to the proposal on arranging the bus routes in Bik Woo and Kwong Hong areas to run via the Western Harbour Crossing (WHC); and
- (b) she agreed to enhance the service of Route No. 682P, but did not think the resources should be re-allocated from Route No. 682.

8. The views of Ms TUNG Kin-lei were summarised below:

- (a) as under the interchanging proposal, Route No. 280X did not run via Tai Wai, and the harbour-crossing bus routes serving Tai Wai did not provide whole-day service, she requested to introduce a whole-day bus route that went along North Sha Tin and Tai Wai via Tsing Sha Highway and Route 8 towards Hong Kong Central and Sheung Wan; and
- (b) she was dissatisfied with the replies of the TD and the bus companies on Route No. 82B. She hoped they could improve the route for the convenience of residents in May Shing Court and Mei Chung Court.

9. The views of Ms PONG Scarlett Oi-lan were summarised below:

- (a) she hoped to introduce a direct route plying from Fo Tan, Sui Wo and Tai Wai to the Hong Kong Island;
- (b) she asked why the implementation of the proposal of Route No. 88X running via Yau Tong was put off; and
- (c) she asked about the feasibility of re-routing Route No. 48P to depart from Fo Tan and run via Yuen Wo Road.

10. The views of Mr NG Kam-hung were summarised below:

- (a) Route No. 985 was a jointly operated route. Although its service had been improved, he still hoped the TD would continue to negotiate with the two bus companies on enhancing its services;
- (b) the problem of lost trips of Route No. 85B during peak hours was serious. This might lead to a decrease of the number of passengers; and
- (c) he hoped the TD and the bus companies could operate an airport shuttle bus route, or arrange the existing airport shuttle buses to go via Hin Keng Street.

11. The views of Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson were summarised below:

- (a) he thought the TD and the bus companies should make good use of Ma On Shan Bypass, Tsing Sha Highway and the WHC, and operate bus routes to Kowloon and Hong Kong Island;
- (b) he hoped Route No. 980X could be gradually extended to provide whole-day service;
- (c) he thought the TD should give consideration to opening up the franchises of bus services to increase competition and improve bus services; and
- (d) if the new proposal of the TD and the bus companies was to reduce the number of trips of Route No. 682P from ten to nine, he would not support it.

12. Mr CHING Cheung-ying pointed out that most passengers of Route No. 281M were the elderly, while those of Route No. 80M were working people. So, both routes were of equal importance for Sun Tin Wai. The passenger volume in Sun Tin Wai was very stable, and the reason that the total volume of passengers declined was due to the decline of passengers in other sections of the route other than Sun Tin Wai. So, he disagreed that Route No. 80M provided service only during peak hours in the morning and afternoon, and objected to cutting down of the service of Route No. 281M.

13. The views of Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas were summarised below:

- (a) after Route No. 280P was converted to Route No. 280X, the substitute route plying between Sui Wo and Waterloo Road was Route No. 80M. So, the proposal to provide service by Route No. 80M during peak hours in the morning and afternoon only would further reduce the choices of passengers. He asked how many bus routes were with the occupancy rate lower than 40%. He hoped that the existing service of Route No. 80M would be maintained, so as to benefit the residents in Sun Tin Wai, Sui Wo and Fo Tan;
- (b) he thought there was a demand for additional harbour-crossing bus services in Fo Tan and Tai Wai, and proposed to add one to two more stops in Tai Wai for Route No. 280X before it entered the Eagle's Nest Tunnel and increase its frequency; and
- (c) the double-deck buses of the New World First Bus Services Limited/Citybus Limited (NWFB & CTB) stayed for too long at Sha Tin Pai Tau Village, which had blocked other vehicles and the attitude of the bus drivers was undesirable. So, he suggested the buses be only allowed to park at the outskirts.

14. The views of Mr YIU Ka-chun were summarised below:

- (a) he was dissatisfied with the replies of the NWFB & CTB; and
- (b) in the past, the TTC had proposed many times that bus routes should run via Route 8 and the WHC, but the replies of the TD and the bus companies still focused on other routes such as Routes Nos. 182 and 170, while the newly introduced routes did not provide whole-day service. The department and the bus companies did not face up to the problem.

15. The views of Mr CHIU Man-leong were summarised below:

- (a) he did not agree to the re-allocation of two trips from the nine morning trips of Route No. 681P to Route No. 981P, but the frequency should be increased instead. If the TD and the bus companies insisted on operating Route No. 981P by re-allocation of resources, he would like to know the schedule and mechanism of increasing the frequency later on; and
- (b) he asked the TD and the bus companies how many days they needed for observation before they realised the occupancy rates of Routes Nos. 681P and 981P were constantly high, which met the criterion to provide additional buses, and how many days they needed to formally implement the decision after they decided to provide additional buses.

16. Ms CHAN Man-kuen pointed out that a group of bus routes in Sui Wo Court had charged a flat fare for the same section. She enquired about the current progress.

17. Mr YAU Man-chun pointed out that constantly, complaints on Route No. 288 serving Shui Chuen O had been constantly received, which were about the long queues

at a number of stops, but the frequency was still not increased during peak hours in the morning and afternoon. He asked if the TD had fulfilled its due responsibility of supervision. He also requested that the frequency of Route No. 288 be increased during peak hours in the next two weeks; if not, it indicated that the service of the bus company was unsatisfactory. Therefore, the TD should open up the franchise to other bus companies to enhance competition.

18. The views of Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael were summarised below:

- (a) as a whole, the TD and the bus companies did not really make an effort over the years in solving the bus service problem in the Sha Tin District. This reflected a lack of vision;
- (b) he thought the department should seize the opportunity during the extension of bus service franchise to implement the flat fare for the same section as soon as possible, and by then, under the Public Transport Fare Concession Scheme for the Elderly and Eligible Persons with Disabilities, the fare differential between green minibuses and buses would narrow down;
- (c) he questioned why calling for tenders was not required for the franchise for Shui Chuen O ;
- (d) in his opinion, as backup vehicles had been reserved, resources should be increased to operate Route No. 981P, and then the feasibility of resource re-allocation should be reviewed later according to the actual passenger volume;
- (e) the criterion of the TD to increase bus frequency was that the occupancy rate of the bus route should reach 100% during any busiest half an hour of the peak period, and 85% during that hour, but with the calculation of six “standing areas” per square metre. As the Mass Transit Railway Corporation had modified its calculating method, he asked why the bus companies had not yet made the modification; and
- (f) he hoped the TD and the bus companies could actively examine the utilisation of the WHC to provide service. In addition, at present, passengers heading towards Kowloon could only interchange for Route No. 280X at the WHC. He thought the concerned parties should give consideration to enhancing the return trip service of Routes Nos. 982X and 985.

19. Mr WAI Hing-cheung pointed out that in the evening, the queue for Route No. 288 at the bus stop of Shatin Centre was fairly long, giving rise to chaotic situation and affecting the residents in Shatin Centre.

20. Mr LI Sai-hung said he had suggested the sectional fare be charged by swiping the card when passengers got on and off the bus, but the TD and the bus companies replied that it was technically unfeasible. To his knowledge, some bus routes on the Hong Kong Island had implemented the sectional fare proposal. He asked why it was unfeasible in the Sha Tin District. He clarified that in his suggestion swiping the card

when passenger got on and off the bus meant passengers swiped their cards at the bus stop or on the bus while the sectional fare only applied to cross-district sections but not the sections within the same district, so he disagreed that the long-haul bus routes would attract short-haul passengers.

21. Mr LUK Fong-tin, Alex, Senior Transport Officer/Bus/NTE of the TD gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the Bus Route Planning Programme (BRPP) for all districts of Hong Kong was still at the stage of consultation. Besides the routes in Sha Tin which would be greatly affected, the preliminary conception on all other routes would not be made until the territory-wide consultation was finished. Therefore, in Paper No. TT 18/2016, the department tried to cover all the opinions delivered by members at the last TTC meeting for the convenience of discussion;
- (b) he was well aware of the opinions of members on Route No. 82B. The TD and the bus company were currently keeping an eye on the reaction after its fare increase, and hoped to get the fare adjusted;
- (c) the TD and the bus company would actively give consideration to the suggestion of extending Route No. 48P to Fo Tan;
- (d) the TD and the bus companies would actively study the suggestion of having bus routes plying to the Hong Kong Island via Tsing Sha Highway and the WHC, but the primary goal was to fulfil the needs of working people during peak hours. The interchange arrangement during the off-peak hours might be an ideal arrangement with the existing resources, so Route No. 280X was a feasible option. With regard to the failure of Route No. 280X in providing interchange service for cross-harbour passengers heading for Sha Tin, the TD and the bus companies would further study the issue;
- (e) The TD would , together with the bus company, study the feasibility of setting up a stop in Tai Wai for Route No. 280X;
- (f) if it was decided that the proposal on frequency reduction of Routes Nos. 85B and 281M and their conversion to single-deckers was to be implemented, it would be carried out in phases. Review would be conducted after the first phase implementation in order to consider the implementation of the second phase arrangements. The TD would take into account the latest operational statistics before any BRPP was implemented so as to evaluate the up-to-date operations of the related routes and make appropriate adjustments to the programme if necessary;
- (g) the TD would work hard to negotiate with the two bus companies in respect of increasing the frequency of Route No. 980X;
- (h) statistics showed that about 40% of passengers taking Route No. 681P in the morning got off at the stops which were not covered by Route No. 981P, including the Tate's Cairn Tunnel Toll Plaza, Eastern Harbour

Crossing Toll Plaza, Old Wan Chai Police Station and Fenwick Street. The TD and the bus companies did not have the statistics showing among the rest of over 50% of passengers, how many of them would change to Route No. 981P. Moreover, new bus routes might attract new passengers. Nevertheless, the TD and the bus companies would continue to study the current proposal to see if it could meet passengers' needs, and would make amendments to the proposal if necessary;

- (i) with regard to the suggestion of charging flat fare for the same section, no matter whether it was raised within or after the franchise consultation period, the TD would give consideration to it and discuss with the bus companies;
- (j) with regard to the opinions of members on Route No. 288, the TD would study the current service level to see if it was good enough to address passengers' needs, and would make appropriate adjustments in response to the population growth after new estates were completed; and
- (k) although it was technically feasible to implement the two-way section fares, there were difficulties in actual operations and route planning. Some bus routes, due to their features, might fit for the proposal of charging sectional fares by swiping the card when passengers got on and off the bus, but for other bus routes, there might not be enough room on the bus for passengers to walk to the entrance to swipe their cards, as many passengers got on and off during the whole journey. High frequency of passengers boarding and alighting would also extend the total travel time. Moreover, some short-haul passengers would be attracted to take certain long-haul bus routes if the two-way sectional fare proposal was implemented, taking up the ridership of long-haul routes. At the same time, it would reduce the passenger volume of short-haul buses, and thus causing a mismatch of resources.

22. The Chairman proposed that when the TD extended the franchise of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (KMB), it should take some requirements into consideration, including charging the flat fare for the same section, the lost trip problem and introducing harbour-crossing bus service via Route 8. He also asked the department representatives attending the meeting to reflect the opinions to the authorities. With regard to the questions on individual bus routes, he asked the TD and the bus companies to follow them up with individual members.

23. Mr Ingmar LEE, Senior Planning & Development Officer of the KMB gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) he was aware of the opinions of members on Route No. 82B, and the bus company was currently discussing with the TD on how to optimise Route No. 82B after the growth of population in the area;
- (b) under the BRPP for Sha Tin District 2015-16, the KMB put forward a proposal to extend the terminus of Route No. 88X to Fo Tan, which was in preparation and expected to be implemented later this year. Under the programme, the KMB made another proposal of extending the terminus of

Route No. 88X in Kowloon to Yau Tong, which was expected to be implemented in the first quarter of 2017; and

- (c) in response to the population growth, the KMB had reserved resources to enhance the service of Route No. 288 and would study with the TD on the long-term enhancement proposal.

24. Mr Simon WONG, Planning and Scheduling Manager of the NWFB & CTB gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the CTB would reserve some spare vehicles for unexpected needs. For example, if the frequency of Routes Nos. 681P or 981P was inadequate, they would allocate more resources; and
- (b) under the new proposal, the frequency of Route No. 682P departing from Wu Kai Sha would not be reduced; but a trip of Route No. 682 re-allocated from Route No. 682P was one of the three trips departing from Nai Chung under the previous proposal.

Discussion Item

Sha Tin District Bus Route Programme 2016-2017

(Paper No. TT 18/2016)

25. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the TD, KMB, NWFB & CTB and Long Win Bus Company (Long Win) to the meeting.

26. The views of Mr PANG Cheung-wai, Thomas were summarised below:

- (a) he opposed the proposal on Route No. 80M which was going to be implemented in the third quarter of 2017, and suggested the TD present more statistics first;
- (b) he thought the proposal on Route No. 280X required consultation, as some residents were concerned that noises might be produced when buses ran via Sui Wo Road to Greenwood Terrace, unless more quiet vehicles were adopted. He asked whether the buses departing from Greenwood Terrace would run via Sui Wo Road before they turned to other roads;
- (c) he welcomed additional vehicles for Route No. 81K, but hoped the TD and the KMB would keep their promises not to extend the driving route, and should introduce new routes if a new estate was completed;
- (d) he proposed that the terminus of Route No. 85 be extended from Fo Tan Cooked Food Market to Sui Wo Court; and
- (e) charging the flat fare for the return trip of Routes Nos. 80M and 280X was welcomed by the public. He hoped the interchange concessions of Route No. 81K could be applied on Route No. 80M as soon as possible.

27. The views of Mr YIU Ka-chun were summarised below:

- (a) he thought the NWFB & CTB submitted the paper on the series of Route No. 682 too late, and pointed out that the bus company did not respond to the request of members on re-allocating additional resources to Route No. 682. Under the new proposal, five vehicles of Route No. 682 would be cut down, which would greatly affect passengers in City One Sha Tin, Bik Woo, Ravana Garden and A Kung Kok areas in Sha Tin. He asked if the frequency of Route No. 682 could be adjusted to eight minutes instead of ten minutes when the proposal on the route was implemented;
- (b) he asked among the four newly added trips of Route No. 982X, whether two could depart from Shui Chuen O and the other two from Yu Chui Court. In addition, he hoped to introduce Route No. 982X instead of Route No. 182X;
- (c) the NWFB & CTB did not adopt the opinions of members on the driving route and the sectional fare of Route No. 682B when it operated the route, so he thought its promises were not credible; and
- (d) he asked if Route No. 682B would have a stop at City One Railway Station, and whether the sectional fare would remain at \$16.

28. The views of Mr CHING Cheung-ying were summarised below:

- (a) the passenger volume in Sun Tin Wai was stable, but the bus service had been slashed for a long time, including Routes Nos. 74A, 80M, 81K, 82K, 85B and 86, while a compensation or substitute proposal was not provided. He found it unacceptable. As for years the service of the TD and the KMB had been unsatisfactory, he asked if the TD and the bus company would visit the district and listen to the public opinion; and
- (b) he asked when the sectional fare service in the Sha Tin District, the airport shuttle bus service via the areas of Lung Hang Estate and Hin Keng Estate, the bus route plying between Sun Tin Wai and Tai Wai Mass Transit Railway Station and the outbound interchange concession scheme would be implemented.

29. The views of Ms CHAN Man-kuen were summarised below:

- (a) she asked how the TD and the bus companies would follow up the opinions of members after the meeting, and how many buses would be re-allocated from Route No. 49X to Route No. 249X, and why they selected Route No. 49X for resource re-allocation among the No. X routes. As the existing travel time of Route No. 49X was fairly long, if its resources were re-allocated, the waiting time might be longer. Therefore, she had reservations about the proposal; and
- (b) the green minibus service of Route No. 808 was inadequate to meet the needs of all the passengers plying between Kwong Yuen/Kwong Hong area and Ma On Shan. The minibuses were already full when they reached

Kwong Yuen. Without a substitute proposal for passengers plying between Kwong Yuen/Kwong Hong area and Ma On Shan, such as introducing a bus route departing from Shui Chuen O to Ma On Shan via Kwong Yuen or new green minibus service, she found it difficult to support the proposal that Route No. 89D would not run via Wong Nai Tau for the whole day.

30. Mr HUI Yui-yu, Rick thought the opinions on Route No. 80 in the paper did not correspond to the opinions that members raised at the meeting, and the pros and cons were stated against each other. He hoped to know the respective number of members in favour of and against it.

31. The views of Mr NG Kam-hung were summarised below:

- (a) he thought the low passenger volume of Route No. 85B was due to serious lost trip problem;
- (b) he pointed out that Route No. 286X also encountered serious lost trip problem, and asked if the routes in the four M area (namely May Shing, Mei Tin, Mei Chung and Mei Lam) would be split; and
- (c) he asked if Route No. 182 or 170 could be arranged to run via Hin Keng Estate, or a harbour-crossing route could be introduced for the convenience of the residents in the Hin Keng Estate area.

32. The views of Mr CHAN Nok-hang were summarised below:

- (a) he requested to maintain the existing service and resources of Route No. 85B;
- (b) he opposed that only the morning trips of Route No. 86C were kept;
- (c) he hoped return trips of Route No. 982X could be provided and its service could be extended to whole-day service; and
- (d) he thought the consultation method of the annual BRPP was inefficient, and the TD and the bus companies did not listen to members' views.

33. The views of Ms LAM Chung-yan were summarised below:

- (a) she asked how the TD and the bus company would follow up the opinions of members. She thought the supervision of the TD of bus services was poor, so the lost trip problem of Route No. 85B was serious. She hoped the TD and the bus company would not reduce the service of Route No. 85B;
- (b) she asked if the double-deck buses could continue to be adopted for Route No. 281M during peak hours;
- (c) with regard to the proposal that Route No. 286X ran via Un Chau Street during off-peak hours and the request of residents for the introduction of

bus services plying to the Hong Kong Island and the airport, she asked what responses the TD and the bus company would give; and

- (d) she hoped to enhance the service of Route No. 985.

34. The views of Ms TUNG Kin-lei were summarised below:

- (a) she wrote to the KMB recently, requesting to set up a stop for Route No. 286X at Un Chau Street during off-peak hours. She asked the bus company, the TD and the police to cooperate with each other so that her proposal could be implemented;
- (b) the paper only stated that the proposal on Route No. E42 was endorsed by members, but did not mention that members requested to introduce a bus route plying between Tai Wai and the airport. She expressed her disappointment with the content of the paper; and
- (c) she thought the occupancy rate of Route No. 985 was sufficient to prove that the demand of residents in Tai Wai for harbour-crossing bus services was high. She hoped the TD and the bus companies could introduce a harbour-crossing bus route that ran along Fo Tan, Sha Tin and Tai Wai via the Eagle's Nest Tunnel.

35. The views of Mr WONG Fu-sang, Tiger were summarised below:

- (a) on behalf of Ms WONG Ping-fan, Iris, he expressed the hope that Route No. 48A would run via Tsuen Wan Town Centre. The bus company should re-allocate more resources to enhance the service of Route No. 87D rather than redeploying buses from the route. The slash of seven trips of Route No. 682 was too much, and Route No. 980X would run via Ravana Garden;
- (b) he held similar opinions on Routes Nos. 49X and 83X with Ms CHAN Man-kuen. He disagreed with the reason why the bus company chose to re-allocate resources from Route No. 49X. He asked the TD and the bus company if they could guarantee that the frequency of Route No. 89D would remain eight minutes between 8:00 pm to 11:00 pm after Route No. 83X was extended to provide whole-day service; and
- (c) frequency reduction of Route No. 86 would cause a further decline of its occupancy rate, and by then people had to face the problem of route cancellation. He thought the railway and bus services could coexist, but the BRPP was defective each year.

36. The views of Mr TONG Hok-leung were summarised below:

- (a) he agreed to make slight adjustments on Route No. 82K for route enhancement, but the existing frequency was too low. He hoped to know the impact caused by the route not going via Tin Sum Street;

- (b) the proposal did not cover the optimisation of the bus services in Mei Tin Estate, such as the provision of interchange concessions and the sectional fare;
- (c) he proposed to introduce the return service of Route No. 985;
- (d) he thought a whole-day bus route departing from Mei Tin towards Shing Mun Tunnels Bus Interchange should be introduced;
- (e) residents in Tai Wai always hoped for the airport shuttle bus service in the area between Mei Tin Estate and Hin Keng Estate, but Route No. E42 failed to fulfil the demand;
- (f) the paper did not mention the introduction of bus service from Mei Tin to the Eastern District of the Hong Kong Island; and
- (g) he supported the improvement plan proposed by the TD and the bus companies, but thought it lagged far behind the demand. He hoped the TD and the bus companies could take this seriously.

37. Mr CHIU Man-leong believed the only three trips of Route No. N287 that the KMB endeavoured to operate were inadequate. So, he requested the bus company to promise not to lodge an objection if later on green minibuses intended to introduce similar overnight routes. Otherwise, he would find it difficult to support this proposal.

38. The views of Mr WONG Hok-lai were summarised below:

- (a) the TD and the bus companies were only aware of the opinions of members, but did not put forward any new proposal;
- (b) he proposed that Routes Nos. 80 and 286X should run via Mei Chung Court and May Shing Court;
- (c) the last two morning trips of Route No. 985 were usually packed with passengers before they reached Carado Garden or Hin Keng. So, he proposed that the bus company to consider route truncation. In addition, he asked when the return trip of Route No. 985 would be introduced; and
- (d) he hoped to introduce exclusive airport shuttle bus service in Tai Wai.

39. The views of Mr LI Wing-shing, Wilson were summarised below:

- (a) he agreed that Route No. 89D should be optimised to shorten the journey, and it should begin with Route No. 83X, for example, by introducing interchange concessions to keep the fares unchanged and to alleviate the impact on passengers caused by not running via Wong Nai Tau;
- (b) he thought Route No. 86P should correspond with the working and school hours, with the fares being charged by section and the route being optimised;

- (c) the bus service of three trips for Route No. 287 was inadequate. If the frequency could not be increased, consideration should be given to the introduction of the green minibus overnight service;
- (d) he thought the paper should be handed out to members as early as possible. He was worried that if one trip was cut from Route No. 682 from Nai Chung to Lee On, it would cause impact on residents;
- (e) he hoped the TD and the bus company could inform the residents as soon as possible about the implementation of Routes Nos. 86K and 274P running via Nai Chung;
- (f) he hoped Route No. 980X would not be too circuitous; and
- (g) he hoped a stop would be set up again for Route No. A41P at Villa Athena, as the residents there thought the consultation in the past was not comprehensive enough. He had some proposals that could be studied together with the TD and Long Win later. The existing airport shuttle bus service for Ma On Shan was inadequate, while the population of Wu Kai Sha would grow. He hoped the TD and the bus companies could be aware of the demand of residents in Ma On Shan.

40. The views of Mr CHIU Chu-pong, Sunny were summarised below:

- (a) he hoped to know if the service of Route No. 86A could be enhanced after the cut-down of Route No. 86C; and
- (b) as it was difficult for passengers to get on the bus at the stops in Mong Kok, he proposed to increase the bus frequency.

41. The views of Mr CHAN Billy Shiu-yeung were summarised below:

- (a) he disagreed that only two trips for Route No. 86C were kept, and if its service was reduced, the service of Route No. 86A should be enhanced;
- (b) he proposed to introduce the return service of Route No. 982X, and enhance it to whole-day service in the long run; and
- (c) he opposed reducing the frequency of Route No. 74A to one trip per hour.

42. The views of Ms TSANG So-lai were summarised below:

- (a) the existing frequency of Route No. 681 was inadequate, and the problem would get worse if the terminus was extended to Lee On or Wu Kai Sha; and
- (b) the passenger volume of Route No. 87D was pretty high during peak hours in the afternoon. So, she and Mr TING Tsz-yuen both opposed the re-allocation of three trips of Route No. 87D to Route No. 87E. In addition, she proposed that Route No. 87E should run via Kam Ying Court, Saddle Ridge Garden and Kam Lung Court.

43. The views of Mr YAU Man-chun were summarised below:

- (a) the TD and the bus companies were only aware of the opinions of members, but did not put an effort into the improvement of bus services in the Sha Tin District;
- (b) the frequency of Route No. 287X was inadequate, which was especially grave in the section from the Yau Tsim Mong District to Sha Tin during peak hours in the evening, and hence the frequency of the route should be increased. In addition, one trip had already been reduced when Route No. 87A was converted to Route No. 287X;
- (c) he hoped Route No. 82K could make a detour via Shui Chuen O Estate;
- (d) he asked if the existing three morning trips of Route No. 83A could depart earlier;
- (e) he thought Route No. 86C needed to maintain whole-day service; and
- (f) he thought the cooperation of the TD and the KMB with the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) was not as good as expected.

44. The views of Mr LAI Tsz-yan were summarised below:

- (a) the paper only listed out the opinions of members, but did not respond to their requests. He thought it was hardly meaningful;
- (b) he requested that the whole-day service of Route No. 86C be maintained;
- (c) he asked about the reply of the KMB on the proposal of charging sectional fares for Routes Nos. 86K and 89X;
- (d) he did not understand why the frequency of Route No. 798 during peak hours was less than that during off-peak hours. He had written to the bus company, requesting the extension of the service hours of Route No. 798 heading towards Sha Tin, but he thought the replies of the bus company were not sincere enough; and
- (e) he questioned if the bus companies were able to provide appropriate and efficient public bus services, so as to achieve the main aim of the government to provide public bus service in the form of franchise.

45. The views of Mr YUNG Ming-chau, Michael were summarised below:

- (a) he thought the replies received at this meeting was too general. In addition, he thought it was not satisfactory to submit the supplementary information on Route No. 682 at the meeting which were supposed to be submitted beforehand. He requested the Secretariat to upload the information onto the website of the STDC as the appendix of Paper No. TT 18/2016;

- (b) he thought the bus company should extend Route No. 682A to Nai Chung rather than increase the frequency of Route No. 682P departing from Nai Chung. If the bus company insisted on this proposal, he would raise an objection;
- (c) after the terminus of Route No. 680 was moved to Admiralty, there were no direct bus routes heading towards Central from the areas of Saddle Ridge Garden, Kam Ying, Lee On, Chevalier Garden and Tai Shui Hang anymore. He thought the concerned parties should take the opportunity of the introduction of Routes Nos. 981P and 980X to rationalise Routes Nos. 680 and 681 at the same time, and divert the bus service from Ma On Shan to the Hong Kong Island, part of which headed via the WHC towards Central, Wan Chai and Causeway Bay while the other headed via the Eastern Harbour Crossing towards North Point and Fortress Hill area. He had put forward the proposal on routes running via the WHC four years ago, but it had never been adopted. And the existing proposal failed to respond to the requests to increase bus frequency and re-allocate resources;
- (d) the Assistant Commissioner for Transport had said that they would consider the rearrangement of the five trips of Route No. 87D which had stopped running via A Kung Kok Street earlier before to now get back to the route via A Kung Kok again. He asked what decision the TD would make after consideration;
- (e) to his knowledge, seven members in total had expressed their views on Routes Nos. 80 and 80A at the last meeting. He thought the TD should be more rigorous in wording;
- (f) the original purpose of the proposal for Route No. 682 to depart from Park Belvedere was to leave more room for the passengers heading from A Kung Kok towards Siu Lek Yuen. If the route remained departing from Lee On, it would be against the original purpose;
- (g) he pointed out at the last meeting that the fares of Route No. X89D was higher than that of Route No. 89D, but it was not recorded in this paper;
- (h) he thought members still had different views on the proposal on Routes Nos. 87D and 87E. So, he hoped the TD and the bus company would consult the TTC after the proposal was amended;
- (i) if the passenger volume of Routes Nos. 680X and 681P could not be estimated, he proposed that both Routes Nos. 980X and 981P should run via Wan Chai Fire Station and to set up a stop on the opposite side of the road for the return trip, so that Routes Nos. 680X, 681P, 980X and 981P had the same stops in prevention of uneven allocation of resources;
- (j) he believed most members were not satisfied with the replies that the representatives of the TD gave at the meeting, and proposed to invite the TD officers of higher rank to attend the TTC meetings;

- (k) in the past, the bus of Route No. 682 was empty when it departed from Park Belvedere, but now its occupancy rate had reached 50% when it departed from Lee On, and the service on Saturdays was not yet optimized. Therefore he thought the NWFB & CTB failed to respond to the concerns of members; and
- (l) if Route No. 682A departed from Nai Chung, its driving time would only be extended by five to ten minutes. He did not understand why the extension could be accepted for the return trip but not for the outbound trip. He hoped the NWFB & CTB would follow it up after the meeting.

46. The Chairman said that the original purpose to convene this special meeting was in the hope that the TD and the bus companies would follow up the opinions of members proposed at the last meeting. The Secretariat had followed his instruction to send the recordings of the meeting to the TD and the bus companies. If they could not deal with particular proposals, explanations on the progress and difficulties should be given to members.

47. Mr LUK Fong-tin, Alex gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) they would carefully analyse the statistics of Route No. 80M so as to review the proposal of frequency reduction;
- (b) as some members were concerned about introducing a special trip for Route No. 280X at Greenwood Terrace would cause noise nuisance, he would study this problem with the bus company;
- (c) the proposal to adjust the bus service in Sun Tin Wai area was based on the actual occupancy rates of related routes. The TD and the bus companies would refer to the latest statistics on passengers of related routes before implementation of the proposal, so as to decide if any amendment was needed for the proposal;
- (d) the proposal on Routes Nos. 83X and 89D might cause inconvenience to some passengers, but it was necessary to make the interchange arrangement for some routes during off-peak hours in order to make use of resources more effectively. The TD would strive for more attractive interchange concessions from bus companies, so as to alleviate the impact on passengers;
- (e) this paper was not the replies of the TD, but the summary of opinions that members proposed at the last meeting which could help facilitate members' discussion. They would review the practice for the next year;
- (f) as the consultation on the BRPP for all the 18 districts in Hong Kong was not yet finished, the TD and the bus companies could only respond to the opinions of members on some routes at the current stage;
- (g) passengers who used to take Route No. 82K in the area between Mei Tin and Lung Hang could take Route No. 80 or 286X as substitute routes, but the fares were different. The TD and the bus companies would pay

attention to it;

- (h) students currently taking Route No. 80 at Mei Tin or Mei Lam to Sun Chui for going to school could change to Route No. 286X. Therefore, the TD and the bus company hoped to make good use of the resources in provision of direct bus service towards the business area in Kowloon Bay. They would also review carefully on the re-allocation of resources from Route No. 80 to Route No. 80A, and the implementation would be taken step by step according to the actual situation;
- (i) he was well aware of the opinions of members on Routes No. 86C and 286C, and would discuss with the bus company to see if any revision was needed for the proposal so as to alleviate the impact on existing passengers as far as possible;
- (j) with regard to Route No. 287X, the initial plan of the TD and the bus company was to keep the route running via Park Avenue in Mong Kok;
- (k) with regard to Routes No. 85B and 281M, to eliminate the concerns of members, the TD and the bus company would give consideration again to implement frequency reduction and replacement with single-deck buses in two phases. If some routes failed to fulfil the demand during peak hours because of the deployment of single-deck buses, the TD welcomed members to report to the TD or the bus company for follow-up action;
- (l) as it was not certain how many passengers would change to take Route No. 981P from Route No. 681P in the future, the TD and the bus company would see if they could increase rather than re-allocate resources for the introduction of Route No. 981P;
- (m) the TD and the bus company would study the service of Route No. 86C to see if it could be maintained;
- (n) as discussion took time, the TD and the bus company were unable to give the supplementary materials on Route No. 682 to members as soon as possible. These materials were not official consultation documents but were supplementary information to facilitate members' discussion. After listening to the opinions of members, the bus company would enhance the service of Route No. 682 at each stop, and proposed that Route No. 682 should maintain its departure from Lee On;
- (o) the TD and the bus companies listened to the opinions of members very sincerely. After consolidating the opinions from every district, the TD would make a decision on the proposals of all routes. With regard to the proposals that required extensive revision or were controversial, the TD and the bus companies would consult the TTC again. As for the proposals with fewer amendments, the TTC would also be informed of related changes. The TD and the bus companies hoped to tell the TTC about their decisions before the end of June;
- (p) the TD and the bus companies were well aware of the requests of

members about introducing the harbour crossing bus service in Tai Wai and the Sha Tin airport shuttle bus service; and

- (q) the TD needed to take all factors into consideration when planning bus services. So, it was difficult to fulfil all the requests.

48. Mr Ingmar LEE gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) because the area of the terminus of Sui Wo Court was small, buses departing from Greenwood Terrace would not enter the Sui Wo Court Bus Terminus, but passengers in Sui Wo Court could take the regular Route No. 280X;
- (b) Route No. 249X was currently the special route of Route No. 49X and the driving route of both routes were similar. Therefore, it was proposed that resources should be re-allocated from Route No. 49X to Route No. 249X. Statistics showed the occupancy rate of Route No. 49X in the off-peak period was about 50%, and it was still adequate for demand if the headway was adjusted from 8 to 10 minutes to 10 to 12 minutes. In addition to the frequency redeployment of Route No. 49X, KMB also planned to deploy additional resources to set Route No. 249X as whole-day service;
- (c) under the BRPP of this year, there was no proposal on the return service of Routes Nos. 982X and 985 or proposal on Routes Nos. 80 and 280X running via May Shing Court. The bus companies would refer to the opinions of members when making the BRPP in the future;
- (d) most members raised no objection to the proposal to add one trip for Route No. 83A. The bus company would study the appropriate departure time with concerned members when implementing the proposal;
- (e) in response to the actual demand of bus routes, KMB put forward the proposals to adjust bus services, including proposals to increase and reduce resources;
- (f) the KMB had actively provided several interchange and fare concessions in the Sha Tin District and did not have a confirmed timetable for the new concessions. However, under the condition of mutual benefits, the KMB would give consideration to providing fare concessions;
- (g) the proposal on Route No. 82K under the programme this year had replaced previous proposals. Under the new proposal, Route No. 82K could provide direct bus service towards Tai Wai for residents in Sun Tin Wai area;
- (h) with regard to Route No. 83X, the occupancy rate of Kwong Yuen and Shui Chuen O might not be as good as that of Kwong Yuen and Ma On Shan. The KMB would pay attention to the actual demand to adjust the frequency, and strive to make the service level of Route No. 83X meet the actual demand on the one hand, and be similar to that of Route No. 89D

after it was changed to whole-day service on the other hand. In addition, after the merging of Routes Nos. 83X and 83A, the fare would still be lower than that of Route No. 89D; and

- (i) the frequency of Route No. 286X that ran via Cheung Sha Wan Road was more stable than that via Un Chau Street.

49. Mr Simon WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) under the new proposal on Route No. 682, the total number of vehicles of Routes Nos. 682 and 682P had not increased. As the overall turnaround time was shortened, the bus company believed 25 vehicles were adequate to meet the demand with the function of traffic diversion in the district. If the resources were found inadequate in some areas after the proposal was implemented, the NWFB would adjust the service as appropriate;
- (b) under the new proposal, among all the trips of Route No. 682 to be cancelled in the previous proposal, two would be kept to serve passengers in the areas of A Kung Kok and Siu Lek Yuen. During the new service period of Route No. 682P, the driving route of Route No. 682 would remain unchanged. As for the section from Ma On Shan to Heng On, which was the most densely populated area, the total number of vehicles of Routes Nos. 682 and 682P would remain unchanged, while the reduction in the section from A Kung Kok to Siu Lek Yuen would also be lowered;
- (c) according to the current passenger distributions, the occupancy rates of Routes Nos. 682 and 682P departing from Heng On during the morning peak hours were 27% and 72% respectively. It was estimated that after the new proposal was implemented, the number of passengers of Route No. 682 departing from Heng On was 35, and the remaining 90 to 100 seats were for the passengers in A Kung Kok and Siu Lek Yuen with the passenger capacity of 570. As currently there were only 430 passengers in the area between A Kung Kok and Siu Lek Yuen, the new proposal was expected to be able to meet the demand. As the current estimates were based on the fact that only four trips were available for Route No. 682P, it was expected that in Ma On Shan, more passengers of Route No. 682 would shift to take Route No. 682P after the frequency of Route No. 682P increased in the future. Therefore, Route No. 682 could handle the passenger volume in the area between A Kung Kok and Siu Lek Yuen;
- (d) the rationalisation proposal of Route No. 682 aimed to allow residents to ply between Ma On Shan and the Hong Kong Island quickly. According to the actual statistics, the travel time of Route No. 682A after the extension to Nai Chung was even longer than that of Route No. 682P after extension. As a result, the NWFB did not make this proposal;
- (e) with regard to Route No. 682, the departure from Lee On would be maintained, and the frequency would increase from four trips to six trips. This should be able to cater to the needs of some passengers taking Route No. 682 in the area between Heng On and Lee On. In addition, the

frequency of Route No. 682P would be double of the existing frequency. It should be able to attract passengers in Ma On Shan. Based on the above reasons, the new proposal could still be able to enhance the passenger capacity in the area between A Kung Kok and Siu Lek Yuen like the previous proposal; and

- (f) with regard to the proposal on re-routing of Route No. 682B, the NWFB thought under the new proposal, the affected passengers in City One Sha Tin area could still have reasonable substitute methods to head for the East Hong Kong Island directly, so, for the time being, adding a stop for Route No. 682B at City One Sha Tin Station at Chap Wai Kon Street would not be considered.

50. Mr Rayson LAW, Planning and Support Officer I of Long Win gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Long Win had been paying attention to the demand of residents in Tai Wai for the airport shuttle bus service. Under the BRPP 2016-17, it thus proposed to increase the frequency of Route No. E42. Long Win was well aware that members hoped to introduce a direct bus route plying between Tai Wai and the airport. Long Win would continue to pay attention to the occupancy rate and the operational costs for the study on the feasibility of introducing the route in accordance with the guidelines and planning of the TD;
- (b) over the past years, the authorities once rationalised the route of Route No. A41P in response to the population growth in Wu Kai Sha, with consultation on the proposal of the re-routing of Route No. A41P conducted. The proposal was implemented with the approval of the TD. If more stops were set up for the route, the travel time would be extended and existing passengers would be affected. Therefore, Long Win had no intention to re-route Route No. A41P in the district again for the time being. Long Win would keep paying attention to the frequency of Route No. A41P and make a review as appropriate; and
- (c) a detour of existing routes via other districts would extend their travel time. Long Win needed to carefully consider the impact on existing passengers.

51. Ms CHAN Cheuk-lee, Cherry, Executive Officer (DC) 4 of the Sha Tin District Office replied that this special meeting was organised in the way with reference to the last-year special meeting convened for the BRPP. Last year, as time was inadequate and it took time to draft the minutes of meeting, the TD had prepared a document in the same form as Paper No. TT 18/2016 to facilitate members' discussion. This year, according to the request of the Chairman raised at the previous meeting, the Secretariat sent the link of the audio recordings of the meeting, which had been uploaded to the website of the STDC on the next day of the meeting, to the TD and all bus companies by email for their follow-up action. The Secretariat was well aware of the suggestions of members. If a special meeting was to be convened in the future, they would study the feasibility of sending the summary of the minutes of meeting to members before the meeting.

52. The Chairman asked members if they agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Mr CHING Cheung-ying.

53. Members agreed to discuss the provisional motion proposed by Mr CHING Cheung-ying.

54. Mr CHING Cheung-ying proposed the following provisional motion:

“The Traffic and Transport Committee (TTC) of the Sha Tin District Council requests representatives of the KMB and the Transport Department to make a commitment to visit individual constituencies to explain the Sha Tin District Bus Route Programme 2016-2017, and respond to the strong discontent expressed by residents and passengers affected.

Furthermore, representatives of the KMB attending the TTC meetings in the past failed to take effective actions in response to members’ request for improvement of the bus service raised at the meetings, and bus routes were planned improperly repeatedly, which aroused general discontent with the service and planning of the bus service among the residents. Therefore, the TTC requests the KMB to consider replacing all members of the planning team of Sha Tin, hoping that they will work hard to improve the collaborative relationship with all TTC members.”

Mr YAU Man-chun seconded the motion.

55. The Chairman asked if members agreed to endorse the provisional motion in paragraph 54.

56. Members unanimously endorsed the provisional motion in paragraph 54.

57. The Chairman asked if members agreed to address the provisional motion proposed by Ms TUNG Kin-lei.

58. Members agreed to discuss the provisional motion proposed by Ms TUNG Kin-lei.

59. Ms TUNG Kin-lei proposed the following provisional motion:

“Requests Commissioner for Transport to expeditiously pay a visit to the Sha Tin District Council to discuss in depth the bus service in Sha Tin with a view to improving the bus service in Sha Tin.”

Mr YIU Ka-chun seconded the motion.

60. The Chairman suggested adding “The TTC of the STDC” before “Requests ...”.

61. Ms TUNG Kin-lei revised her provisional motion as follow:

“The TTC of the STDC requests Commissioner for Transport to expeditiously pay a visit to the Sha Tin District Council to discuss in depth the bus service in Sha Tin with a view to improving the bus service in Sha Tin.”

Mr YIU Ka-chun seconded the motion.

62. The Chairman asked members if they agreed to endorse the provisional motion in paragraph 61.

63. Members unanimously agreed to endorse the provisional motion in paragraph 61.

64. Mr YIU Ka-chun asked when the TD would respond to the requests proposed at this meeting, and whether the new proposal on Route No. 682P would be discussed again at the next TTC meeting.

65. Mr SIU Hin-hong thought most members hoped that the bus service level could be improved. Members could put forward more specific proposals for the TD and the bus companies to follow up. He thought it was hard to expect the KMB to improve its service. Transferring its franchise might be able to improve bus service.

66. Mr LUK Fong-tin, Alex replied that the TD and the bus companies conducted a consultation on the BRPP in about March every year, listening to the opinions of members and then consolidating the opinions from all districts. The TD and the bus companies would consult the TTC on the proposals with extensive revisions, and the proposals with fewer amendments might be implemented first. The whole BRPP was expected to be implemented before the end of June.

67. The Chairman said that the replies on the provisional motions endorsed at this meeting should be submitted to the TTC in July.

68. The meeting ended at 6:10 pm

Secretariat of the Sha Tin District Council
STDC 13/15/45

July 2016