

Bills Committee on Rail Merger Bill

List of follow-up actions (position as at 12 April 2007)

I. Property-related issues

Information/Follow-up actions required	Latest position / Administration's response
<p><u>Date of meeting: 27 July 2006</u></p> <p>(a) Basis and methodology adopted by the professional valuer appointed by the Government in conducting valuation of the property and related commercial interests included in the property package;</p> <p>(b) Details of the valuation of the property package of the rail merger proposal;</p> <p>(c) Given the Administration's reply that disclosure of the valuation of individual property sites not yet tendered would cause a disadvantage to the post-merger Corporation (MergeCo) during the future tender process, the Administration was requested to explain, with reference to Government's public works and land sale programme, and Hong Kong Housing Authority's (HKHA) property development projects, how the disclosure of relevant project estimates/open market value (OMVs) had caused disadvantage to the Government or HKHA in the past tender exercises, and whether OMV reserve prices of individual sites as estimated by the Government/HKHA were made known to potential bidders in the past;</p> <p>(d) Why the valuation of the eight property development sites conducted by the professional valuer appointed by Government would differ significantly from those prepared by other professional valuers as quoted in the press, and whether the properties were disposed of at a severely diminished valuation;</p> <p>(e) The triggering mechanism and factors to be considered in invoking the proposed railway property development control mechanism to enable Government to exercise control on the level of flat production arising from the tender programme for railway property developments; and</p> <p>(f) The basis, calculation method and discount rate adopted for</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2198/05-06(02) on 18 September 2006.</p>

Information/Follow-up actions required	Latest position / Administration's response
projecting the assessed development profits (in present value) associated with the selling of the rights over the property development sites to MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL).	
<u>Date of meeting: 20 September 2006</u> (a) The Administration and MTRCL to disclose all information relevant to their valuation of the property package; and (b) MTRCL to explain the relationship between property development and railway fares and how profit from property development would be used to benefit the travelling public in future.	The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2282/05-06(01) on 3 October 2006.
<u>Date of meeting: 5 October 2006</u> Supplementary information on transacted sale prices of residential flats at New Town Plaza.	The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)147/06-07(01) on 23 October 2006.

II. Fare-related issues

Information/Follow-up actions required	Latest position / Administration's response
<p><u>Date of meeting: 27 July 2006</u></p> <p>(a) Earliest date for fare adjustment under the fare adjustment mechanism (FAM);</p> <p>(b) Illustration of the changes of railway fares over the past 20 years by applying the FAM formula;</p> <p>(c) As the adoption of a FAM for adjusting public transport fares was already an established Government transport policy, the FAM for adjusting railway fares should be implemented without further delay to enable the general public to enjoy fare reduction at the earliest opportunity, and the FAM should also be delinked from the present rail merger exercise;</p> <p>(d) Measures to ensure objectivity and transparency of the productivity factor in the FAM formula; and</p> <p>(e) Details and basis of the calculation of the different levels of fare reduction, and their relationship with the synergies arising from the rail merger.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2198/05-06(02) on 18 September 2006.</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 2 November 2006</u></p> <p><i>General</i></p> <p>(a) Details of synergies of the rail merger and the basis of calculation;</p> <p>(b) In what way would overseas investment of the MergeCo affect its fares in future, in particular if investment losses were incurred by MergeCo;</p> <p>(c) Overseas experience of fare regulation, how their mechanism evolved and how it affected the operation and performance of railway services;</p> <p>(d) Projections of the financial performance for MergeCo for the ten years after the rail merger as commissioned by the Administration or the two railway corporations;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)258/06-07(01) on 13 November 2006.</p>

<p align="center">Information/Follow-up actions required</p>	<p align="center">Latest position / Administration's response</p>
<p><i>Fare adjustment mechanism</i></p> <p>(e) Illustrations in the form of a table showing the actual working of applying the permitted range for adjusting individual Controlled Fares under different situations, and factors that would be taken into account by MergeCo in finalizing the rate of adjustment to individual Controlled Fares;</p> <p>(f) Justifications for providing MergeCo with the flexibility to adjust individual Controlled Fares within the range of ± 10 percentage points from the overall fare adjustment rate under the FAM, bearing in mind the FAM for franchised bus companies did not provide for such flexibility;</p> <p>(g) How the Administration/MergeCo would address the public concern that railway fares would be subject to significant changes if the proposed adjustments to individual Controlled Fares within the permitted range were allowed, and how would it be seen as fair and acceptable to the travelling public to apply different rates of fare increase/decrease for different fares within the railway network;</p> <p>(h) Given that the FAM formula did not include any factor to reflect the profits received from property development by MergeCo, whether the Administration would consider using part of the profits from property development to set up a fare stabilization fund, or modify the FAM to take into account profits from property development so as to moderate the rate of fare increase;</p> <p>(i) In view of the uncertainty over the permitted rate of increase under the FAM, whether the Chief Executive-in-Council or Legislative Council (LegCo) should be given certain degree of control over future fare adjustments and whether a cap should be imposed on the rate of fare increase ;</p> <p>(j) Given that the scope for productivity gain for railway operation was limited, the inclusion of the productivity factor in the FAM might lead to a higher rate of fare increase in the end, particularly when productivity would likely reduce in future with the diminishing contribution from property development. What are the current value of the productivity factor of the railways and the projection of the values of productivity factor of MergeCo for the next ten years;</p>	

<p align="center">Information/Follow-up actions required</p>	<p align="center">Latest position / Administration's response</p>
<p>(k) Illustration of the hypothetical changes of railway fares over the past period, say 30 years, by applying the FAM formula;</p> <p><i>Existing concessionary and promotional programmes</i></p> <p>(l) Whether the existing interchange concessions offered by the two railway corporations would continue after the merger. Whether the gains of the travelling public from fare reduction packages would be offset by the cancellation of interchange concessions;</p> <p><i>Concessionary fares for persons with disabilities (PwDs)</i></p> <p>(m) Whether an undertaking could be given by the Administration to grant concessionary fares to PwDs if a clear definition of PwDs was available to determine the number of eligible passengers; and</p> <p>(n) The railway corporations' projection on the number of PwDs that would be eligible for concessionary fares, the financial implication for providing such concession and the basis of their calculation.</p>	
<p><u>Information requested by Hon LAU Kong-wah</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration has allowed MergeCo to adjust flexibly individual fares within the range of ± 10 percentage points from the overall fare adjustment rate under the FAM. What are justifications for setting the range at ± 10 percentage points? Will the range be reduced?</p> <p>(b) In accordance with the above-mentioned flexibility of adjusting fare, will the Administration explain whether or not railway fares for remote districts will be subject to higher rates of fare increase? In what way can the Administration ensure that the financial burden of the public will not be increased?</p> <p>(c) What are the formulae adopted by the two railway corporations for calculating fares and what are the details of the structure of fare? Will the fares be set according to distance in kilometres?</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)258/06-07(04) on 15 November 2006.</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)258/06-07(04) on 15 November 2006.</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)258/06-07(04) on 15 November 2006.</p>

<p align="center">Information/Follow-up actions required</p>	<p align="center">Latest position / Administration's response</p>
<p>(d) What were the factors considered by the two railway corporations in adjusting fares? What is the weighting of the profit from property development?</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)258/06-07(04) on 15 November 2006.</p>
<p>(e) As the FAM formula does not include any factor that reflects MergeCo's profit from property development, will the Administration explain whether it is different from the situation in the past? If so, what are the reasons for the change?</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)258/06-07(04) on 15 November 2006.</p>
<p>(f) Will the Administration consider asking MergeCo to take into account the two major factors namely affordability of the public and socio-economic changes when adjusting fares? If not, what are the reasons?</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)258/06-07(04) on 15 November 2006.</p>
<p>(g) In applying the proposed FAM formula from 1985 to 2005, it was found that the fare adjustments rates were greater than the actual fare adjustments of MTR lines and East Rail in 13 years. The Administration was requested to provide explanation in this regard.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)258/06-07(05) on 13 November 2006.</p>
<p>(h) Whether the future fare adjustment rate of MergeCo would be greater than the average fare adjustment rate of the two railway corporations in the past.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)258/06-07(05) on 13 November 2006.</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 14 November 2006</u></p> <p>(a) Detailed breakdown of synergies of the rail merger and the basis of calculation; and</p> <p>(b) Details of previous cases whereby railway corporations, bus companies or green minibus operators set their individual fares at</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)383/06-07(01) on 28 November 2006.</p>

<p align="center">Information/Follow-up actions required</p>	<p align="center">Latest position / Administration's response</p>
<p>rates different from the overall fare adjustment rates.</p>	
<p><u>Date of meeting: 30 November 2006</u></p> <p>(a) Further details on the synergies of the rail merger amounting to \$450 million per annum and the basis of calculation, in particular those synergies coming from the areas of procurement and support functions;</p> <p>(b) Details on actual adjustments of individual fares of MTRCL in 1996, which featured an overall fare increase rate of 6.9% with deviation from the overall adjustment rate from +13.1% to -6.9% for that year;</p> <p>(c) Given the Administration's explanation that if it was to adopt the same approach used for calculating the productivity gain of the franchised bus industry in Hong Kong to measure the productivity performance of the railway industry, it would yield a negative result of -2.6% per annum, the Administration was requested to provide further details to explain the actual working of the calculations, bearing in mind the effect of the conclusion was that the rate of increase in revenue in the past was much lower than the rate of increase in cost whereas the actual situation was that MTRCL was making huge profit each year; and</p> <p>(d) A paper to explain how property profits had been taken into account when the railway corporations set the initial fares of the relevant new railways, and to account for such a significant policy change.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)442/06-07(01) on 8 December 2006.</p>
<p><u>Information requested by Hon LAU Kong-wah</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration's written reply in response to a Legislative Council question raised by Members at the Council meeting of 29 November 2006 has set out, in table form, the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation (KCRC)'s net profits generated from sale of properties along the East Rail, Light Rail Transit and West Rail as well as net profits from property management, leasing of shops, offices and residential units, commercial businesses in railway stations and other business. Would the Administration please advise whether KCRC has taken profits of the property development into account upon their completion when considering the fare adjustment annually?</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)483/06-07(02) on 13 December 2006.</p>

<p align="center">Information/Follow-up actions required</p>	<p align="center">Latest position / Administration's response</p>
<p>(b) Would the Boards of the two corporations not discuss the profits of the property development in adjustment of fares?</p> <p>(c) At the last meeting, MTRCL mentioned that they had based on competition in adjusting the fares. Please use examples to illustrate the past situation of competition and rate of fare adjustments.</p>	
<p><u>Date of meeting: 12 December 2006</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration was requested to consider reducing the scope of flexibility granted to MergeCo to adjust individual fares from the fare adjustment rate calculated in accordance with FAM.</p> <p>(b) In view that the agreed formula for annual adjustments in fare would be applied automatically, the Administration was requested to consider the following alternatives to fine tune the proposed FAM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to set up a fare stabilization fund to moderate the rate of fare increase under the FAM by using profits from property developments; • to empower the Chief Executive in Council or LegCo to have the ultimate power to determine the rate of fare increase or decrease under the FAM; or • to require MergeCo to consider other factors such as prevailing economic conditions, its operating environment and public affordability before determining the rate of fare increase or decrease under the FAM. <p>(c) With reference to the implementation of Tsuen Wan Line and Kwun Tong Line, MTRCL was requested to provide information on the variation, if any, between the then estimated and actual profits from property developments, and the usage of the windfall profits from property developments.</p> <p>(d) With reference to the implementation of individual railway lines, MTRCL was requested to illustrate the variation in monetary values if different rates on top of the weighted average cost of</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 1).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 2).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/06-07(03) on 5 March 2007.</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No.</p>

Information/Follow-up actions required	Latest position / Administration's response
capital were applied for calculating the commercial return of railway projects.	CB(1)1071/06-07(03) on 5 March 2007.
<u>Date of meeting: 30 March 2007</u> The Administration to consider reducing the flexibility granted to MergeCo to adjust individual fares within the permitted range allowed under the proposed FAM.	Response awaited.

III. Staff-related issues

Information/Follow-up actions required	Latest position / Administration's response
<p><u>Date of meeting: 27 July 2006</u></p> <p>KCRC was requested to render assistance to its staff to facilitate their registration as registered skilled workers with the Construction Workers Registration Authority.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2198/05-06(02) on 18 September 2006.</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 24 October 2006</u></p> <p>The two corporations to inform the Bills Committee of the result of their consultation with staff on the employment terms and conditions of MergeCo and other relevant human resources matters.</p>	<p>Response awaited.</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 28 October 2006</u></p> <p>(a) KCRC to explore the feasibility of allowing Kowloon-Canton Railway Operation Staff Association (KCR OSA) to send email messages to KCRC staff on condition that such messages would not exceed a certain number to be worked out between KCRC and KCR OSA;</p> <p>(b) the Staff Consultative Council, MTRCL and the two consultative committees of KCRC to respectively provide a chart to show how the councilors and the members of the two consultative committees were elected; and</p> <p>(c) MTRCL and KCRC to give their assurances regarding the selection of staff to fill posts in the MergeCo in more specific terms and in writing.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)639/06-07(01) on 8 January 2007</p>

IV. Integrated Operating Agreement (IOA)

Information/Follow-up actions required	Latest position / Administration's response
<p><u>Date of meeting: 19 December 2006</u></p> <p>(a) Given that IOA would stipulate that, for individual new railway projects which were not natural MTR-extension projects, Government had the right to determine whether the "ownership approach" (under which MergeCo would fund, construct and operate the new railway) or the "concession approach" (under which Government would fund the construction of the new railway and MergeCo would be granted a service concession to operate the new railway) should be adopted, some members were concerned that, with only one railway corporation left after the rail merger, and hence a monopolistic situation, the Administration would have little bargaining power when negotiating with MergeCo on which approach should be adopted for implementing the above new railway projects. The Administration was therefore requested to provide (i) details on the rationale behind the introduction of the above "right" upon the merger instead of continuing to adopt the "ownership approach" only, (ii) the rationale behind the adoption of differential arrangements for taking forward railway projects which were natural MTR-extension or not, and (iii) the criteria for determining which approach would be adopted, using the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) as an example;</p> <p>(b) Having regard that MergeCo would require an appropriate commercial rate of return to be determined on a case-by-case basis for undertaking New KCR and New Separate Projects under the concession approach, the Administration was requested to elaborate how the commercial rate of return and the initial fares for these railway projects would be determined;</p> <p>(c) MTRCL to provide information on the performance levels of MTR with reference to international standards;</p> <p>(d) Prior to changing the level of any fare, MergeCo was requested to consider the level of public acceptance of any proposed change based on passenger surveys, and consult the Panel on Transport; and</p> <p>(e) The Administration was requested to provide a copy of the existing Operating Agreement (OA) between MTRCL and the Government; and account for the major differences between the existing OA and IOA.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)627/06-07(01) on 5 January 2007.</p>

<p><u>Date of meeting: 9 January 2007</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration to consider, in respect of the requirement under IOA for MergeCo to give written notification to LegCo before implementing fare adjustments, whether MergeCo would respond to queries raised or requests for information by LegCo and whether MergeCo would attend meetings of LegCo to answer members' questions on the relevant subject if requested;</p> <p>(b) Given that the proposed arrangement under the FAM was to require the MergeCo to formally notify the Transport Panel and the Transport Advisory Committee in writing within a reasonable period prior to implementation of the new fares, the Administration was requested to consider specifying in clear terms when the notification should be given;</p> <p>(c) The Administration to provide a table setting out the railway lines outlined in the Railway Development Strategy 2000 or discussed by the Subcommittee on Matters Relating to Railways under the Transport Panel in the past six years, and specify which of them were natural extensions of MTR and which were not; and</p> <p>(d) The Administration to provide information in the bidding proposals from the two railway corporations for SCL.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)710/06-07(01) on 12 January 2007</p>
<p><u>Information requested by Hon LAU Kong-wah</u></p> <p>(a) KCRC had pledged that it would finance the construction of the SCL after it was awarded the construction and development of the project through open tender in 2002. What were the details of the financing proposal? Was the revenue from the property developments along the new railway included in the financing proposal?</p> <p>(b) Would the Administration explain why MTRCL could retain the original property development rights of the SCL and the relevant revenue generated even if it chose not to fully finance the construction of the SCL?</p> <p>(c) The implementation of the rail merger was premised on public interests. According to the original plan, the construction of the SCL would be fully financed by KCRC and no capital injection from the Government was required. Had the Government worked out the expenditure incurred in case the construction was eventually taken up by MergeCo without fully financing it? Was it fair to the general public?</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)681/06-07(01) on 10 January 2007</p>

<p><u>Date of meeting : 16 January 2007</u></p> <p>(a) MTRCL to disclose the three property development sites which MTRCL required Government to grant property development rights in its bidding proposal for SCL;</p> <p>(b) The Administration to provide a paper on the legal status of the award of the SCL project to KCRC, particularly the legal rights and obligations of Government/KCRC in respect of the SCL project;</p> <p>(c) KCRC to provide a paper reporting on the progress of SCL, including the progress of the various studies related to SCL, the alignment and stations design, the difficulties encountered in taking forward SCL and the estimated implementation timetable.</p> <p><u>Clause 3.6</u></p> <p>(d) MTRCL to provide information on how the air flow condition and level of carbon dioxide within the compartments of train cars plying lines starting from or passing through Central were checked, and whether the readings could comply with the standards set by the Environmental Protection Department in this regard, in particular during peak hours.</p>	<p>Response awaited.</p> <p>Response awaited.</p> <p>Response awaited.</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/06-07(03) on 5 March 2007.</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 23 January 2007</u></p> <p><u>Clause 3.6</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration to discuss with MTRCL the need to state clearly in clause 3.6 of IOA that MergeCo should, apart from monitoring and recording the environmental conditions throughout the enclosed areas of the railway, make improvements in response to relevant complaints according to the Administration's directions where necessary;</p> <p>(b) The Administration and MTRCL to explain the meaning of the terms "enclosed areas" as used in clause 3.6. In particular, the Administration should confirm whether Hunghom Station would be considered an enclosed area;</p> <p>(c) The Administration to explain whether there was any difference between the Chinese translations, i.e., "持續" and "連續", of the term "continuous" in clause 3.6;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/06-07(03) on 5 March 2007.</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/06-07(03) on 5 March 2007.</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/06-07(03) on 5 March 2007.</p>

<p>(d) MTRCL was requested to address the emission of foul odour at MTR stations;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 24).</p>
<p><u>Clause 3.7</u></p>	
<p>(e) The Administration to examine and report back on the feasibility of amending clause 3.7.1 to ensure that the lighting in areas of the railway premises accessible to the public could meet standards set out in the relevant design guidelines to facilitate access by visually impaired persons;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007.</p>
<p><u>Clause 4.1</u></p>	
<p>(f) The Administration to consider amending clause 4.1.1 to set out the requirement to notify media under the specified circumstances as stipulated in clause 4.1.1;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 23).</p>
<p><u>Clause 4.2</u></p>	
<p>(g) The Administration to provide in the form of a chart details on the respective minimum levels of Train Service Arrangements for different lines of the KCR and MTR systems in relation to the matters covered in clauses 4.2.1(a) and 4.2.1 (b);</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/06-07(03) on 5 March 2007.</p>
<p><u>Clause 4.6</u></p>	
<p>(h) The two railway corporations were requested to address the concerns about excessive noise generated by railway operations and maintenance activities;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 32).</p>
<p><u>Public toilets</u></p>	
<p>(i) The Administration and MTRCL to consider including relevant provisions in IOA to ensure the provision of public toilets at rail stations, particularly existing MTR stations; and</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No.</p>

<p><u>Others</u></p> <p>(j) The Administration to advise whether IOA contained any provisions which had already been covered in the relevant regulations and By-laws.</p>	<p>CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 25).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007.</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 29 January 2007</u></p> <p><u>Clause 4.4</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration to advise whether it would allow MergeCo to broadcast audio or audio-visual programmes in train compartments and train stations, and whether the current restrictions as set out in the KCRC By-laws governing the conduct of passengers to avoid causing a nuisance or annoyance to other passengers should form the basis of Government's policy in relation to any aspects of the transmission of audio or audio-visual programmes in train compartments and train stations;</p> <p>(b) The Administration to provide a copy of the guidelines in relation to the regulation over the broadcasting of audio or audio-visual programmes in franchised buses;</p> <p>(c) The Administration to provide information on the guidelines on the regulation over the broadcasting of audio or audio-visual programmes in train compartments, and consider setting out in the guidelines the requirement to (i) provide a minimum proportion of Quiet Zones/Cars, say 50%, among the train compartments; and (ii) provide the broadcasts of news programmes and advertisements in train compartments in the mute mode with captions;</p> <p>(d) KCRC to provide information on the survey conducted by KCRC on the provision of on-board broadcasts of news programmes and advertisements, including the relevant questionnaire;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 11).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 10).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 12).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1071/06-07(03) on 5 March 2007.</p>

<p>(e) The Administration to consider stipulating in the IOA the requirement for MergeCo to provide radio reception on board its trains;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 13).</p>
<p><u>Clause 4.6</u></p>	
<p>(f) The Administration to provide details on the criteria the Environmental Protection Department would consider in issuing the construction noise permits to KCRC for the railway maintenance works under the Noise Control Ordinance (Cap. 400);</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 30).</p>
<p>(g) The Administration to provide details on the statutory limits of the noise emitted due to railway operations and whether it was appropriate to make reference to noise limits of overseas jurisdictions in setting the limit, and the two railway corporations' measures to rectify the exceedance cases;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 29).</p>
<p>(h) The Administration to consider stipulating in the IOA the requirement for MergeCo to comply with the guidance notes, practice notes and advice as might be issued by the Government from time to time relating to the noise level emitted due to maintenance works;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 31).</p>
<p>(i) The Administration to provide information on measures taken by the Environment, Transport and Works Bureau, and the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau at the initial planning stage of railway development to ensure that residents along the railway corridor would not be exposed to excessive railway noise upon implementation;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 33).</p>
<p><u>Clause 4.7</u></p>	
<p>(j) The Administration and the railway corporations to provide information on measures taken to ensure the provision and maintenance of a reliable ticketing system for the efficient and effective collection of fares, particularly in the light of the equipment failure happened on 10 January 2007, leading to overcharging of passengers using Octopus cards.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)872/06-07(01) on 2 February 2007.</p>

<p><u>Date of meeting : 6 February 2007</u></p> <p><u>Clause 4.7</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration to consider amending clause 4.7 to the effect that MergeCo should provide and maintain adequate staff and a reliable ticketing system for the efficient, effective and accurate collection of fares;</p> <p>(b) The two railway corporations to consider</p> <p>(i) providing bi-directional wide gates at all KCR stations; and</p> <p>(ii) improving the design of ticketing machines to facilitate access and use by persons with different types of disabilities.</p> <p>(c) The two railway corporations to consider the proposal to display the remaining stored value on an Octopus card when passenger touched the card on the Octopus Fare Deducting Processor at entry gate, and provide the cost estimate for the related upgrading works;</p> <p>(d) In relation to the recent incident of inaccurate fare deduction from Octopus card in MTR Kowloon Tong Station, the Administration to provide information on the records furnished by the two railway corporations regarding the malfunctioning of the ticket gates, and how Government would monitor the performance of railway corporation in order to ensure the provision of a reliable and accurate fare collection system ;</p> <p>(e) The Administration to consider including the requirement of the reliability of MTR fare saver machines under IOA;</p> <p>(f) The two railway corporations to consider introducing new/maintaining existing concessionary monthly ticket schemes;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 3).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 55).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 6).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 7).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 8).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 9).</p>
--	--

<p><u>Clause 4.8</u></p> <p>(g) The Administration to consider amending clause 4.8 to further require that MergeCo should ensure that all smart card handling facilities were at all times accurate;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 5).</p>
<p><u>Clause 4.9</u></p> <p>(h) The Administration to consider amending clause 4.9 to the effect that MergeCo should provide and maintain adequate and reliable escalators and lifts for the safe, efficient and effective transportation of passengers within stations;</p> <p>(i) The Administration to consider adding a new clause to the effect that lifts should be provided near the main entrances of station and platform as far as practicable;</p> <p>(j) The Administration to consider adding a new clause to the effect that MergeCo should review the provision of lifts annually and to adjust the level of provision having regard to the results of the annual review on the demand for lift services by passengers;</p> <p>(k) In relation to accidents on escalators inside railway stations in the past two years, the two railway corporations to provide statistics of those accidents, including the number of injuries and the related claims, and follow-up actions taken by the two railway corporations to reduce escalator accidents; and</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007.</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 51).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 52).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007.</p>
<p><u>Clause 4.10</u></p> <p>(l) The Administration to consider introducing an objective and effective system, for the purpose of issuing warnings and/or imposing financial penalty on MergeCo for any repeated failures by MergeCo to comply with any Performance Requirement.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 34).</p>

Date of meeting: 13 February 2007

Clause 4.10

- (a) The Administration to illustrate how the impact of service disruptions during peak hours had been taken into account in the existing Performance Requirements;

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007.

Clause 4.10.1

- (b) The Administration to consider amending clause 4.10.1 to the effect that MergeCo would be required to provide information to the LegCo concerning any failure by MergeCo to meet any Performance Requirement during an assessment and setting out the circumstances under which information pertaining to the failure by MergeCo to meet any Performance Requirement would be made public;

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 35).

Clause 4.10.2

- (c) The Administration to consider amending clause 4.10.2 (b) to the effect that at any other time or times during the Operating Period, the Commissioner for Transport (the Commissioner) could, having regard to the results of any customer surveys covered by reports furnished pursuant to clause 4.13.3, request a joint review of the Performance Requirements in conjunction with MergeCo;

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 36).

Clause 4.10.3

- (d) The Administration to consider the need of requiring MergeCo to brief LegCo of the Performance Requirements for New Projects before such New Projects were commissioned;

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 37).

Clause 4.12.2

- (e) The two railway corporations to
- i) consider providing a breakdown of passenger complaints by categories when publishing passenger complaint data under clause 4.12.2(b);
 - ii) consider including data on railway incidents when publishing data in relation to accidents etc. on the railways under clause 4.12.2(c); and

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 38).

<p>iii) consider publishing on a quarterly basis instead of on an annual basis data on issues covered in clauses 4.12.2(c) and 4.12.2(d);</p> <p><u>Clause 4.12.3</u></p> <p>(f) The Administration to improve the wording of the clause to the effect that MergeCo should also provide and maintain accurate add-value machines and to introduce a new Performance Requirement/Customer Service Pledge for measuring the accuracy of the add-value machines;</p> <p>(g) The Administration to consider adding a new Customer Service Pledge on the reliability of facilities provided to persons with disabilities viz. wheelchair lifts, stair lifts, escalator audible devices, Braille plates, flashing system map, bi-directional wide gates, toilets for PwDs, lifts and tactile guide paths for the visually impaired; and</p> <p><u>Clause 4.12.4</u></p> <p>(h) The Administration to discuss with MTRCL on how to refine clause 4.12.4 to the effect that MergeCo should take appropriate follow-up action should MergeCo constantly fail to meet the Customer Service Pledges listed in clause 4.12.3.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 4).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 59).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 39).</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 27 February 2007</u></p> <p><u>Clause 4.13</u></p> <p>(a) The two railway corporations to consider reviewing the arrangements for measuring customer satisfaction with their railway services so as to gauge passengers' views on whether they were satisfied with the way the railway corporations handled a particular railway incident and the related contingency arrangements;</p> <p>(b) KCRC to provide findings of previous passenger satisfaction surveys with regard to customer satisfaction with the contingency measures implemented during KCR railway incidents;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 40).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 41).</p>

<p>(c) KCRC to consider improving the arrangements for measuring customer satisfaction with the Light Rail (LR) service and consider improvement measures such as installing platform gates at LR stations, improving the open fare and ticket inspection system so as to reduce conflicts between passengers and LR staff, introducing monthly ticket scheme for short-haul journeys, improving the traffic light, enhancing the safety of signalized pedestrian crossings across the LR tracks, etc;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 42).</p>
<p>(d) The Administration to consider stipulating in clause 4.13 that the report submitted by MergeCo under clause 4.13.3, including the Administration's assessment of the report and suggested follow-up actions to be taken by MergeCo, should be made public;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 43).</p>
<p><u>Clause 4.14</u></p>	
<p>(e) The Administration to consider revising clause 4.14.1 to the effect that MergeCo should set up users consultative committee, which should include, inter alia, users from PwDs and the elderly;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 53).</p>
<p>(f) MTRCL to provide information on the criteria adopted in inviting PwDs organizations for joining their consultative procedures;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 54).</p>
<p>(g) The Administration/two railway corporations to consider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) publicizing the contents of the report furnished to the Administration under clause 4.14.2 on the internet;ii) making public the Administration's assessment on the report, including and suggested follow-up actions to be taken by MergeCo;	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007.</p>
<p>(h) The Administration to consider revising clause 4.14 to the effect that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) the Administration could, at any time during the operating period, request MergeCo to furnish a report summarising the complaints and suggestions received by MergeCo on any specific matters in relation to its railway services and any action taken by MergeCo thereon;	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007.</p>

- ii) a new provision allowing the Administration, based on the report submitted by MergeCo to the Administration under clause 4.14.2, to request MergeCo to conduct passenger satisfaction survey on issues in relation to its railway services which were of great public concern but not included in the Customer Service Pledges stipulated in clause 4.12.3;

Clause 4.15

- | | |
|--|--|
| (i) The Administration to consider specifying a minimum display area for the signs and passenger information in every station so as to ensure the clearly display of passenger information at convenient locations; | The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 14). |
| (j) The two railway corporations to consider displaying a hotline number near the ticket and add-value machines for passengers to make enquiries and seek in-station assistance; | The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 15). |
| (k) The Administration to consider revising clause 4.15 to the effect that <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) MergeCo should provide and maintain tactile guide paths, appropriate contrast tactile guide paths, anti-slip stair treads and escalator audible signals;ii) MergeCo should display on railway premises and the approaches thereto appropriate signs and information in Chinese and English, Braille texts and display systems with audible sounds and captions; | The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 56). |
| (l) MTRCL to explore any flashing light system used in overseas rail systems that would not have an adverse effect on persons with epileptic symptoms; | The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 57). |

Clause 4.16

- | | |
|---|--|
| (m) The Administration to provide details of cases in the past two years, if any, in which the Administration had requested MTRCL to consider specific suggestions made under clause 4.16.2 for changes in operation of its railway services but MTRCL had decided not to adopt any such suggestions. | The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007. |
|---|--|

Date of meeting: 6 March 2007

Clause 5.2

- (a) The Administration to clarify whether there is any repetition of the reference to "such instructions have safety implications" in clauses 5.2.2 (a) and (b);

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007.

Clause 5.3

- (b) The Administration to consider amendments to ensure impartiality of the independent safety expert or to assume a more proactive role in the selection process of the independent safety expert engaged by MergeCo;

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 17).

- (c) The Administration to consider refining the drafting of clause 5.3 to clearly express that a review of the safety management system would be conducted at any time with the agreement of MergeCo and the Inspector but in any case the interval of such review should be not more than three years;

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 18).

Clause 5.5

- (d) The Administration to consider including the maintenance schedules and procedures referred to in clause 5.5.3 in the list of submissions to the Inspector as stipulated in clause 5.2.1.;

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 16).

Clause 5.6

- (e) The Administration to provide a breakdown of the workforce employed by the two railway corporations in terms of full-time staff, part-time staff, permanent staff, contract staff, direct staff employed by the two railway corporations and contract staff employed by contractors engaged by the two railway corporations;

The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 19).

<p><u>Clause 5.7</u></p> <p>(f) MTRCL to set out the difficulties in installing Automatic Platform Gates (APGs) at above-ground MTR stations;</p> <p><u>Clause 5.8</u></p> <p>(g) The Administration to consider amending clause 5.8 to the effect that the contingency plans to be developed by MergeCo should cover arrangements for matters other than those listed in clause 5.8 such as refund arrangement; and</p> <p><u>Clause 6.1</u></p> <p>(h) The Administration to provide information on how the issue on “wind shield effect” can be addressed in all property development projects to be undertaken by the two railway corporations in future, including those in the pipeline which had yet to be developed.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 20).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 21).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 22).</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 13 March 2007</u></p> <p><u>Clause 11</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration to consider requiring both parties to submit disputes under the IOA to arbitration if that dispute is not resolved through informal negotiation “within a reasonable period of time”. Such requirement should not prejudice the right for both parties to seek injunctive or other judicial relief at any time;</p> <p>(b) The Administration to provide information on how the financial terms for the operation of new project under the concession approach could be finally determined if MergeCo is obliged to operate new project under the IOA;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 45).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 44).</p>

<p><u>Clause 12.2</u></p> <p>(c) The Administration to consider adding “reasonable” apart from “in good faith” in describing the actions taken or omitted to take by MergeCo; and to draw reference on the agreement between Government and franchised bus operator on similar matters, if any;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 46).</p>
<p><u>Clause 13</u></p> <p>(d) The Administration to consider revising clause 13 to ensure that the review of the terms of the IOA would take into account public affordability;</p> <p>(e) To ensure the impartiality and transparency of the review, the Administration to consider inviting academics, independent professionals or LegCo Members to undertake the review, and making public the result of the review;</p> <p>(f) The Administration to consider carrying out the first periodic review of the IOA on the third anniversary of the date of the IOA;</p> <p>(g) The Administration to consider specifying that the first periodic review should cover the review of the Fare Adjustment Mechanism;</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 49).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 47).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 48).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 50).</p>
<p><u>Clause 14.1</u></p> <p>(h) The Administration to consider revising clause 14.1 to include records of –</p> <p>i) reliability of facilities provided for PwDs;</p> <p>ii) number of assistance required by PwDs.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 58).</p>

<p><u>Clause 17</u></p> <p>(i) The Administration to explain why the intercity passenger service and freight service are not subject to the same set of performance requirements and customer services pledges for domestic service.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 27).</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 16 March 2007</u></p> <p>(a) The Administration to review the drafting of clauses 18.3.1 and 18.5 to ensure that the Government could disclose Restricted Information where necessary without obtaining the agreement of MergeCo;</p> <p>(b) The two railway corporations to examine all possible means to improve the air flow at platforms of non-enclosed railway stations with reference to the cooling devices used by the rail operators of hot places such as Kuala Lumpur and Singapore; and</p> <p>(c) The Administration to give a consolidated response to issues raised by Dr Fernando CHEUNG vide LC Paper Nos. CB(1) 755/06-07(01), CB(1)1071/06-07(01), and CB(1)1006/06-07(01).</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 28).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1247/06-07(01) on 28 March 2007 (Item 26).</p> <p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1293/06-07(01) on 2 April 2007.</p>
<p><u>Date of meeting: 30 March 2007</u></p> <p><u>Clause 4.4.1 - Passenger Environment</u></p> <p>(a) The two railway corporations to examine possible means to improve the air flow and stuffy environment at platforms of non-enclosed railway stations;</p> <p><u>Clause 4.6 – Noise</u></p> <p>(b) The Administration to provide information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) the noise level of train operation near both ends of non-enclosed railway stations;(ii) the noise level of railway maintenance works;	<p>Response awaited.</p> <p>Response awaited.</p>

<p>(c) The two railway corporations to advise the quantity of their acoustics screens / sheds used for railway maintenance;</p> <p>(d) The Administration to consider stipulating in the IOA the requirement for MergeCo to comply with the guidance notes, practice notes and advice as might be issued by the Government from time to time relating to the noise level emitted due to maintenance works; and</p>	
<p><u>Clause 4.13 – Measuring Customer Satisfaction</u></p>	<p>Response awaited.</p>
<p>(e) KCRC to provide a summary of passengers' views collated from various sources, including customer liaison groups, personal interviews, passenger hotlines, etc, on the way the corporation handled a particular railway incident and the related contingency arrangements.</p>	
<p>Separately, the Administration was requested to examine practicable means in the context of the Noise Control Ordinance to address the exceedance cases in which noise emitted due to railway operations or maintenance works was above the statutory limit as mentioned by members at the meeting and revert to the relevant panel(s) of the LegCo.</p>	<p>To be followed up by relevant LegCo Panel(s).</p>
<p>The Administration was requested to follow up with the relevant Authority on members' request for a review of the existing operational and system procedures for handling add-value transactions through EPS to safeguard the interests of cardholders.</p>	<p>To be followed up by relevant LegCo Panel(s).</p>

V. Other issues

Information/Follow-up actions required							Latest position / Administration's response	
<p><u>Date of meeting: 5 October 2006</u></p> <p>(a) The existing consultation machinery to gauge the views of PwDs on the provision of access facilities for PwDs, its mode of operation, composition and meeting schedules, etc; and</p> <p>(b) Improvement to the provision of access facilities for PwDs at Yau Tong Station and Lam Tin Station.</p>							<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)147/06-07(01) on 23 October 2006.</p>	
<p><u>Date of meeting: 12 December 2006</u></p> <p>Given that the Ombudsman was presently empowered to investigate complaints of maladministration by KCRC or initiate direct investigation into significant issues, and areas of maladministration in the absence of complaints, the Administration was requested to advise whether the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman would be affected as a result of the rail merger, and whether Part I of Schedule 1 to the Ombudsman Ordinance (Cap. 397) would cover the MergeCo.</p>							<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1220/06-07(01) on 26 March 2007.</p>	
<p><i>Information requested by Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo</i></p> <p>(a) Please provide information on the shops and offices in relation to the East Rail and Light Rail Transit using the table below.</p>							<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)640/06-07(02) on 5 January 2007.</p>	
Railway Line	Property / Item	Leasable Area (square feet)		Retail Occupancy Rate (as of 31.12.2005)	Office Occupancy Rate (as of 31.12.2005)	Retail - Revenue in 2005 (\$ million)		Office - Revenue in 2005 (\$ million)
		Retail	Office					
East Rail	Citylink Plaza							
	Plaza Ascot							
	KCRC Hung Hom Building							
	Man Lai Court Shopping Arcade							

Light Rail	Ocean Walk (formerly Pierhead Plaza)					
	Hanford Plaza					
	Sun Tuen Mun Plaza					

(b) The property development rights for eight properties will be transferred upon the merger. They cover few property developments along the West Rail. In this connection, would the Government provide the following information:

- Does the MergeCo have the property development rights for the properties along the West Rail listed in the table below?
- If yes, is the MergeCo required to pay additional premium for developing these properties? Why are these properties not mentioned in the merger?
- If no, does it mean that the Government will resume them for open tender?
- Will the profits gained from these property developments go into the MergeCo's revenue? Or will they go to the Government in full?
- Please provide expected tender invitation date and gross floor area using the table below.

Property projects along West Rail	Site area (hectares)	Expected tendering dates	Gross Floor Area (square feet) (Note (1))
Nam Cheong			
Yuen Long			
Tuen Mun			
Tsuen Wan West			
Long Ping			
Tin Shui Wai			
Kam Sheung Road			
Pat Heung Maintenance Centre			
Kwai Fong			

Note (1): The gross floor area figures exclude Government, Institution or Community facilities and public transport interchanges.

<p>(c) Has the Government reserved any sites for subsidizing the development of Lok Ma Chau Spur Line? If yes, please provide the details including the area, location and the gross floor area of the sites concerned.</p> <p>(d) While the construction and operation rights of SCL were awarded to KCRC back in 2002, so far construction of SCL has not commenced. Will the progress of the SCL project be affected by the progress of the rail merger? Will the SCL project be implemented only upon the setting up of the new railway company?</p>	
--	--

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
12 April 2007