

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)2579/01-02
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/TP/1

LegCo Panel on Environmental Affairs and and LegCo Panel on Transport

**Minutes of joint meeting held on
Tuesday, 18 June 2002, at 10:45 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Members of the LegCo Panel on Transport

- * Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, JP (Chairman)
- * Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Dr Hon David CHU Yu-lin, JP
- * Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, JP
- * Hon LAU Kong-wah
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP
- * Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon WONG Sing-chi
- * Hon LAU Ping-cheung

Members of the LegCo Panel on Environmental Affairs

Hon CHOY So-yuk (Chairman)
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon SIN Chung-kai
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP
Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS
Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

(* Also members of the LegCo Panel on Environmental Affairs)

Non-Panel member attending : Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP

Members absent : Members of the LegCo Panel on Transport

Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon CHAN Kwok-keung
Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP
Hon LAU Chin-shek, JP
Hon LEUNG Fu-wah, MH, JP

Members of the LegCo Panel on Environmental Affairs

Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan
Dr Hon LO Wing-lok

Public officers attending : **Agenda item II**

Transport Bureau

Ms Carolina YIP
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport

Environment and Food Bureau

Mr Howard CHAN
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food

Transport Department

Mr S M LI
Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban

Environmental Protection Department

Mr K S CHAN
Principal Environmental Protection Officer

- Attendance by invitation** : **Agenda Item II**
- Joint Conference of Transport Trades Against Road Closure Schemes (Joint Conference)
- Mr Ricky WONG
Convenor of Joint Conference and representative of Hong Kong Container Tractor Owner Association
- Mr AU-YEUNG Kun
Representative of United Friendship Taxi Owners & Drivers Association
- Mr LAM Kwai-keung
Representative of the Association of NT Radio Taxicabs
- Mr HO Hung-fai
Representative of Hong Kong Dumper Truck Drivers Association
- Mr IP Moon-lam
Representative of the Hong Kong Union of Light Van Employees
- 中重型貨車關注組代表
Mr LAI Kin-tak
- Mr Simon LAU
Representative of Hong Kong Container Drayage Services Association
- Mr Stanley CHIANG
Representative of Lok Ma Chau China-Hong Kong Freight Association
- Mr Richard TSANG
Representative of Hong Kong Association of Aircargo Truckers
- Clerk in attendance** : Mr Andy LAU
Chief Assistant Secretary (1)2
- Staff in attendance** : Ms Alice AU
Senior Assistant Secretary (1)5
-

Action

I Election of Chairman

Ms Miriam LAU was elected as Chairman of the joint meeting.

II Proposed traffic management schemes to address traffic noise problems
(LC Paper No. CB(1)1807/01-02(01) - Information paper provided by the Administration)

2. The Chairman recapped that at the previous joint meeting of the Environmental Affairs, Transport, and Planning, Lands and Works Panels held on 15 January 2002, members were informed that the Transport Department (TD) and the Environmental Protection Department had completed traffic surveys and assessed the potential environmental benefits from implementing night-time traffic management measures at five locations identified for trial. The following schemes were proposed for consideration:

- (a) full closure of East Kowloon Corridor (EKC);
- (b) full closure of Kwai Chung Road Flyover outside Kwai Fong Estate;
- (c) full closure of Texaco Road Flyover in Tsuen Wan;
- (d) banning of goods vehicles over 5.5 tonnes along Ngan Shing Street in Sha Tin; and
- (e) banning of goods vehicles over 5.5 tonnes along Po Lam Road between Kowloon and Tseung Kwan O.

At the meeting, members were also informed that consultations with the relevant District Councils (DCs) and the transport trade on the proposed schemes were underway. The Administration undertook to provide members with an update upon completion of the consultations.

3. The Chairman drew members' attention to the consultation results and the proposed way forward for the five schemes as set out in the information paper provided by the Administration (LC Paper No. CB(1)1807/01-02(01)). According to the Administration's present proposal, trial schemes would be implemented at EKC, Kwai Chung Flyover, Texaco Flyover and Ngan Shing Street, while the scheme at Po Lam Road would be dropped.

Views presented by deputations

4. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the Joint Conference of Transport Trades Against Road Closure Schemes (Joint Conference) to the meeting.

Action

5. Mr Ricky WONG, Convenor of the Joint Conference and representative of Hong Kong Container Tractor Owner Association, said that the transport trades were extremely worried about the adverse impact the Administration's present proposal would have on their operation and livelihood, which were already very difficult under the current economic conditions. Hence, they had come together to form the Joint Conference to represent their unified front in this matter. The transport trades were of the consensus view that as illustrated by the night-time trial ban of heavy vehicles at West Kowloon Corridor (WKC) in late 2000, the use of traffic management measures to restrain vehicles from using certain roads was not a real solution to the problem of excessive traffic noise on nearby residents. While a minimal noise reduction of 1 to 2 dB(A) was recorded at WKC, the noise level at alternative routes was increased by about 3 dB(A). Hence, there was no need to conduct other trials because it was already very clear that the problem was merely diverted to the alternative roads at ground level.

6. On consultation by the Administration, Mr Ricky WONG stated that in view of the strategic functions served by the flyovers/road section under the present proposal, the Administration should not only seek the views of local DCs. Instead, relevant DCs which might also be affected or connected by such roads/flyovers should also be consulted to ascertain the overall traffic implications of the proposed schemes.

7. Speaking on behalf of the urban taxis trade, Mr AU-YEUNG Kun of United Friendship Taxi Owners & Drivers Association referred members to the Association's submission tabled at the meeting (issued subsequently vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2037/01-02(01)). Highlighting the grave concern felt by the urban taxis trade, he said that the Association had recently conducted an experiment at EKC to assess the impact of the proposed night-time closure schemes on the trade's operation. When compared with travelling via EKC, the trip from Tsim Sha Tsui to Kwun Tong by an alternative route would result in a longer journey (8 km versus 6 km) and hence, higher fare (\$62.6 versus \$48.6) and longer travelling time (9 minutes versus 6 minutes). As such, the passengers would be less inclined to take taxis if they were no longer able to travel by the most direct and fastest route. The business of the urban taxis trade would certainly be affected. Hence, he called on the Administration to reconsider its proposal. After all, flyovers were constructed to move vehicular traffic quickly. If vehicles were banned from using the flyovers, such road resources would no longer be effectively used to serve Hong Kong's economic development.

8. Mr LAM Kwai-keung of the Association of NT Radio Taxicabs spoke on behalf of the New Territories (NT) taxis trade. He stated that NT taxis were fundamentally confined to operate in rural areas in NT, the Airport and certain locations in the urban area through specified routes. The closure of Texaco Flyover would have a great impact on the business of the NT taxis trade, particularly for trips to and from the Airport.

Action

9. Mr IP Moon-lam of the Hong Kong Union of Light Van Employees referred members to the Union's submission tabled at the meeting (issued subsequently vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2037/01-02(02)). He considered that the problem with excessive traffic noise at flyovers was mainly a result of improper planning and design by the Administration. Instead of facing up to its responsibility and identifying real solutions to the problem, the Administration was simply asking the general public and the transport trades to pay the price for its mistakes and bear all the inconvenience the closure schemes created.

10. Speaking also on behalf of the grab-mounted lorry trade and the refuse compactor trade, Mr HO Hung-fai of Hong Kong Dumper Truck Drivers Association stated the trades' strong opposition to the Administration's proposal. In particular, he explained that dumper trucks engaged in highway and road projects would need to travel via EKC at small hours in the morning to transport tar and bitumen from the plants on Anderson Road. Hence, the closure of EKC would have a great impact not only on the trucking trade, but also on the general public. Furthermore, given the strong smell from the refuse compactor trucks, he was worried that if they were banned from the proposed flyovers/road section, opposition might be attracted from the residents along the alternative routes.

11. Mr Richard TSANG of Hong Kong Association of Aircargo Truckers stated the strong opposition of the air cargo trucker trade on the proposed closure schemes. Referring to the busy operation of the air freight industry at night-time, he stressed that the closure schemes proposed by the Administration would have a great impact on the operation of air cargo truckers. He called on the Administration to reconsider its proposal taking into account the livelihood problems that might be created.

12. Citing the increasing scale of night-time operation of medium and heavy vehicles, say for the transportation of fresh produce/poultry and heavy machinery, Mr LAI Kin-tak of 中重型貨車關注組 drew members' attention to the plight faced by the trade if the proposed closure schemes were to be implemented. In particular, he was worried that such schemes would become precedents and other roads might also be closed for the purpose of noise mitigation. This would have a serious impact on their operation. He also pointed out that even if the drivers were willing to use alternative routes, it would still attract strong opposition from the nearby residents who were not affected originally.

13. Mr Stanley CHIANG of Lok Ma Chau China-Hong Kong Freight Association also highlighted the importance of maintaining speedy transportation of cross-boundary freight to the Airport during night-time. Referring to the results of the trial ban at WKC earlier on, he said that only a minimal reduction of noise level was recorded. However, the use of alternative routes would create many new problems for both the drivers and the public, such as extra journey time and fuel consumption which would result in air pollution, excessive noise due to frequent "stop and go" movements of vehicles at signalized road junctions at ground level roads, etc. Hence, the Administration should examine all these considerations and find a right balance

Action

between the interests of all parties concerned. Mr Ricky WONG also referred to the development of stronger economic ties between Hong Kong and the Mainland, and said that cross-boundary freight transport via land crossings would increase. Given that the Huanggang/Lok Ma Chau crossing was now operating round-the-clock to serve goods vehicles, some of these traffic would switch to night time.

14. Mr Simon LAU of Hong Kong Container Drayage Services Association stressed that the proposed closure schemes would run counter to the correct emphasis placed by the Government on the development of logistics industry in Hong Kong. In particular, he said that many cities in the Mainland would only allow access of vehicles after dark and heavy vehicles engaging in cross-boundary freight transport would have to drive through certain major trunk routes at night. He reiterated the view that instead of road closures, the Administration should consider imposing a suitable speed limit on excessive noisy roads and flyovers so as to minimize the disturbance of traffic noise on nearby residents. In this matter, he also criticized the Administration for failing to conduct meaningful consultation with the transport trades.

The Administration's response

15. The Principal Assistant Secretary for the Environment and Food (PAS for E&F) stated that when considering the implementation of traffic management measures to address the impact of traffic noise, the Administration would take the following guiding principles into account:

- (a) alternative routes should be available;
- (b) the noise problem should not be shifted from one location to another;
- (c) the proposals must be supported by local residents; and
- (d) the successful implementation of any traffic management schemes would require the understanding and co-operation of the transport trades.

16. PAS for E&F further advised that after the night-time trial ban of heavy vehicles at WKC, the Administration had been following up on the results to see if further improvements to the proposed scheme could be made. The Administration had also been maintaining continuous dialogue with the transport trades on the implementation of other trial schemes so as to ensure that the interests of all parties concerned were properly balanced. In order to better assess the way forward, the Administration considered it necessary to conduct trial schemes at the proposed locations so that useful information could be collected for assessing the effectiveness of using traffic management measures to address traffic noise, particularly in respect of the resulting traffic diversion and its noise impact as well as potential noise benefits to be achieved.

Action

17. While acknowledging the concerns raised by the transport trades, PAS for E&F called on members and the transport trades to support the Administration's proposal to conduct short-term trial schemes at the concerned locations. Details of the trial schemes would be fine-tuned taking into account the views expressed by the deputations at the meeting. He stressed that a thorough evaluation would be conducted after the trials and the relevant DCs and the transport trades would be briefed before any decision on implementing the schemes on a permanent basis was made.

18. On consultation with DCs, PAS for E&F assured members that subject to the findings of the trial schemes on the flow and volume of traffic diversion, the Administration would revert to the local DCs and consult other DCs where necessary.

19. As regards the concern raised by the NT taxis trade about the closure of Texaco Flyover, the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban (AC for T/Urban) advised that upon the closure of the Texaco Flyover, NT taxis could use the ground level roads immediately underneath the flyover. Except for the signalized junctions at the ground level roads, the two routes were essentially the same.

Members' discussion with the Administration

20. Members in general acknowledged that the problem of nuisance created by excessively noisy roads/flyovers should be addressed while striking a right balance between the interests of all parties concerned. However, they were concerned about whether the Administration had thoroughly assessed the overall impact of such schemes before putting forward its proposal, particularly the diversion of traffic noise from one location to another. Moreover, they considered that the problem should be tackled at root. Before considering the option of road closure, the Administration had a duty to explore all other direct engineering and non-engineering options including retrofitting, resurfacing and provision of technical remedies such as good quality windows and air-conditioners to the affected dwellings.

Assessment of overall impact of the proposed closure schemes

21. Mrs Selina CHOW stated objection to the proposed trial schemes. While acknowledging the plight of those residents living near to excessively noisy roads/flyovers, she expressed grave concern about the impact of road closures on Hong Kong's economic development. In this regard, she enquired about the rationale for introducing such a drastic measure on a territory-wide basis and queried whether the Administration had assessed its proposal from an economic point of view. She pointed out that transport infrastructure such as roads and flyovers was constructed primarily to facilitate the speedy movement of goods and people. However, with the proposed schemes, these precious resources were not fully utilized while additional congestion might be created. It was indeed a high price to be paid by the whole society, particularly when considering the minimal noise

Action

Admin reduction to be achieved. Hence, she found it hard to accept the Administration's ill-conceived proposal. Instead, she called on the Administration to further examine the feasibility of retrofitting noise barriers at the proposed locations in the light of latest engineering and technical developments.

22. Echoing Mrs Selina CHOW's views, Mr Tommy CHEUNG questioned whether a thorough economic impact assessment had been carried out by the Administration on the proposed trial schemes. Considering that road closure was but a passive means, he asked whether the use of other direct mitigation measures had been considered by the Administration.

23. Considering that traffic management measures could not bring about a real solution to the problem, Mr David CHU did not support the implementation of the proposed trial schemes. He found it difficult to accept that flyovers and roads which were built to facilitate traffic flow should be left unused, while the problem of traffic noise would invariably be diverted to another location creating additional noise and air pollution.

24. Miss CHOY So-yuk said that she could only accept the implementation of closure schemes as an interim measure. In the long run, the Administration should explore other direct ways in which the problem of traffic noise could be abated. She suggested that incentives such as relaxation of plot ratio could be considered so as to encourage the developers to implement noise insulation measures such as installation of air-conditioners and double-glazed windows as part of green features of environmentally friendly buildings.

25. Mr SIN Chung-kai took the view that the Administration would need to carefully assess the overall impact of its proposal, particularly the resulting noise nuisance and air pollution created as a result of the "stop and go" movements of vehicles at signalized road junctions along alternative routes. In this connection, he enquired about the work done by the Administration to resurface the relevant flyovers with low noise materials. The Chairman also asked whether the problem of unwanted noises resulting from uneven expansion joints at flyovers had been tackled by the Administration.

26. Miss Emily LAU acknowledged that there was no easy solution to the problem. While the plight of those long-suffering residents living next to the concerned flyovers/road section should not be left unaddressed, the Administration would have to ensure that the noise was not simply diverted to another location and hence impacting other residents. In view of the concerns raised by the transport trades and members, she considered that the Administration should further consult all interested parties and fine-tune its present proposal to address their needs and concerns. She also agreed that the Administration would need to conduct a sustainability assessment on the social, economic and environmental impact of the proposed schemes, particularly in respect of potential improvement in the health of the affected residents.

Action

Admin

27. Referring to the repeated calls from the Tsuen Wan District Council to conduct trial closures at the Kwai Chung Flyover and the Texaco Flyover, Mr Albert CHAN did not agree that the Administration's present proposed should be abandoned outright. However, citing the heavy traffic at these two flyovers during night-time, he was concerned about the creation of congestion by the detoured traffic at signalized junctions along the alternative routes. As a related matter, Mr CHAN suggested that the Administration should also review the current policy in addressing the problem of traffic noise. Consideration should be given to imposing full-time or night-time restriction against entry of heavy goods vehicles to certain residential areas which would provide much relief to the affected residents.

28. Responding to the views and concerns raised by members, PAS for E&F stated that the problem of excessively noisy roads had existed for many years. All along, repeated calls had been made by the affected residents for the Administration to study the feasibility and effectiveness of traffic management schemes with a view to granting relief to residents. For example, requests had been repeatedly made by the Kowloon City District Council and Sham Shui Po District Council to conduct trial closures at EKC and WKC. However, given the considerable operational and enforcement problems involved, it would not be practicable to implement traffic management measures at all existing excessively noisy roads. After careful consideration, the Administration now proposed to implement trial traffic management schemes at four locations which were considered practicable.

29. As far as the implementation of direct engineering solutions was concerned, PAS for E&F advised that at present, surfacing materials with certain noise attenuation effect had already been used for all flyovers/expressways in Hong Kong. At the same time, the Highways Department would closely monitor the condition of flyovers to ensure that they were properly maintained. However, the retrofitting of noise barriers/enclosures at the proposed locations was considered not practicable. As the direct mitigation of traffic noise at source was not feasible for the flyovers/road section in question, the use of traffic management measures was proposed so as to reduce the noise to a lower level.

30. PAS for E&F further said that detailed assessment on the traffic impact of the proposed trial schemes had been conducted by TD. To supplement, AC for T/Urban reported that in general, no adverse traffic impact had been identified and the journey times for the alternative routes would not be significantly longer than if the flyovers were used. As the alternative routes would have sufficient capacity to cope with the detoured traffic, the Administration believed that no major adverse economic impact would be created as a result. Addressing members' concern about the economic impact of the proposed closure schemes, PAS for E&F said that upon completion of the trials, the Administration would be in a better position to realistically assess their overall economic impact.

Corresponding increases in noise level along alternative routes

Action

Admin

31. The Chairman queried whether the Administration had assessed the corresponding increases in noise level along alternative routes, particularly the noise nuisance created as a result of the “stop and go” movements of vehicles, especially heavy vehicles, at signalized road junctions as highlighted by the transport trades. Referring to the information paper provided by the Administration for the joint meeting on 15 January 2002 (LC Paper No. CB(1)770/01-02(02)), the Chairman informed members that according to the Administration’s assessment, while there would be reduction in the noise level of about 8dB(A) for approximately 2 600 dwellings along EKC, there would be increases in the noise level of about 5 to 7 dB(A) affecting approximately 8 600 dwellings along the alternative routes due to the diverted traffic. In order to give members an overall picture of the situation, the Chairman suggested that all relevant information should be clearly presented in future papers to be provided to the joint Panels.

32. Mr LAU Kong-wah opined that in that case, the Administration should drop the trial closure scheme at EKC immediately because it was clearly in contravention of the guiding principle cited by the Administration that no closure schemes would be considered if the noise problem would be shifted to another location. From an environmental point of view, it was clearly not acceptable that under the Administration’s proposal, noise nuisance would be created for other residents who were not originally affected.

33. Regarding the noise impact on residents along alternative routes, PAS for E&F assured members that in most cases, the number of vehicles affected during the proposed restriction period would be very small. For example, for the proposed closure of the Kwai Chung Road Flyover and the Texaco Flyover, the maximum hourly traffic volume during the proposed closure period was about 360 vehicles in both directions for each of the flyovers. Given the diversion of traffic to different alternative routes, the noise impact along alternative routes might not be very high.

34. As far as the “stop and go” movements of vehicles were concerned, PAS for E&F said that the level of noise created could be affected by driving behaviour. TD would also try to ensure that the timing of the traffic lights at consecutive road junctions was synchronized to allow vehicles to drive through without stopping unnecessarily. In that case, the level of vehicle emissions created would be roughly the same. Moreover, the flyover above would act as a shield to the traffic noise at ground level roads during the closures. In the case of the closure of the Kwai Chung Flyover and the Texaco Flyover, the lower floors of the residential buildings facing the two flyovers were mainly for commercial use. Both Mr Tommy CHEUNG and representatives of the transport trades however did not agree with PAS for E&F’s statement that the noise problem created as a result of “stop and go” movements of heavy vehicles was caused by improper driving behaviour.

35. PAS for E&F further said that the Administration considered it appropriate to conduct the trial traffic management schemes as proposed to assess their

Action

effectiveness and actual impact before deciding on the way forward. In considering the matter, the Administration would need to strike a right balance between the interests of all parties concerned. While the corresponding increase in noise level along the alternative routes would be carefully assessed, the reduction in noise level for the affected residents, say in the case of EKC was as much as 8dB(A), would also be an important factor.

36. Mr Tommy CHEUNG however considered that the absolute value of noise level reduction per se was meaningless. The actual noise benefit could only be shown against the existing noise level along the concerned flyovers/road section. In response, PAS for E&F explained that while the improvements in terms of noise reduction might not be substantial in all cases, the night-time closure of flyovers/road section could effectively eliminate the nuisance created by sporadic noises caused by passing vehicles.

37. Highlighting the importance for the Administration to strike the right balance between the interests of all parties concerned when applying any control measures, Mr CHENG Kar-foo enquired about the assessment criteria in determining whether full closure of the concerned flyovers/road section at night-time should be adopted as a permanent measure.

38. In response, PAS for E&F advised that it would not be appropriate for the Administration to base its decisions simply on the absolute value of noise level increase/reduction along the concerned flyovers/alternative routes. He assured members that subject to the results of the trials, the Administration would consider each case on its own merits, taking into account all relevant factors after consultation with the affected residents and the transport trades.

39. Notwithstanding the Administration's reply, Mr LAU Kong-wah considered that the Administration should adopt a gradual approach in this matter. As the traffic noise would not be diverted to another location, he would support the implementation of the proposed trial scheme at Ngan Shing Street. However, for those schemes which might result in the increases of noise level along alternative routes, the Administration should further consult the views of all interested parties before deciding whether trial closures should be implemented.

Admin 40. Under the circumstances, the Chairman opined that there was a strong case for the Administration to revisit its stance about providing indirect technical remedies in the form of good quality windows and air-conditioning to those residents living right beside EKC. Sharing the Chairman's view, Miss Emily LAU also called on the Administration to consider whether fuel cost subsidizes could be provided to the transport trades if they were required to take a longer alternative route.

41. After deliberation, members agreed that the joint Panels would hold another meeting on Friday, 19 July 2002, from 2:30 pm to 5:30 pm to receive public views and continue discussion with the Administration.

Action

- Admin 42. To facilitate members' consideration, members requested the Administration to provide further information on the following before the next joint meeting:
- (a) the sustainability assessment and economic impact assessment of the proposed trial schemes;
 - (b) the traffic impact assessment of the proposed trial schemes including the existing traffic flow, shift in traffic pattern and forecast traffic conditions at individual signal-controlled road junctions along the alternative routes upon implementation of the proposed trial schemes;
 - (c) the background noise levels along the concerned flyovers/road section, and the ground level roads underneath the concerned flyovers/alternative routes before and after the implementation of the proposed trial schemes including the number of affected dwellings;
 - (d) an update on the implementation of the low noise resurfacing programme including improvement to expansion joints for the concerned flyovers/road section;
 - (e) the feasibility of erecting noise barriers on the concerned flyovers/road section;
 - (f) the financial implication of providing air-conditioning and double-glazed windows to the affected dwellings along the concerned flyovers/road section;
 - (g) the assessment criteria in determining whether full closure of the concerned flyovers at night time should be adopted as a permanent measure; and
 - (h) a breakdown of the forecast improvement to traffic noise problems, and the shift in traffic pattern and associated traffic impact if different types of vehicles are banned from entering the concerned flyovers at night-time.

Action

III Any other business

43. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:45 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat

23 September 2002