

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(1)2319/09-10

Ref: CB1/PL/TP

Panel on Transport Meeting on 28 June 2010

Background brief on safety of franchised bus operation

Purpose

This paper gives an account of the major views and concerns expressed by members of the Panel on Transport (the Panel) in past discussion on the safety of franchised bus operation.

Background

2. The Transport Department (TD) monitors the operation of franchised bus services in accordance with the Public Bus Services Ordinance (Cap. 230) and the Road Traffic Ordinance (RTO) (Cap. 374) and their Regulations. The franchised bus operators are required to carry out maintenance and repair as the Commissioner for Transport may specify, and TD's examiners are empowered to inspect the buses and maintenance facilities at any reasonable time. While buses should observe the general speed limits designated on roads, the maximum speed of a bus is restricted under RTO to 70 km/h on roads with a posted speed limit over 70km/h.

Serious bus accidents in recent years

3. A number of serious traffic accidents involving franchised buses occurred in mid-2003, in particular the traffic accident on Tuen Mun Road on 10 July 2003, in which a bus carrying 40 passengers broke through a section of vehicular parapet and plunged into the hillside about 31 metres beneath, resulting in 21 fatalities and 20 injuries. As a result of this accident, the Tuen Mun Road Traffic Incident Independent Expert Panel was appointed to make recommendations to improve Hong Kong's highway safety. The Panel has since been reviewing with the Administration and franchised bus companies measures to enhance the safety of bus operation. At the Panel meeting held on 28 November 2003, the Administration reported that it had requested all the franchised operators to conduct a safety review, covering aspects such as the correlation between bus accidents and drivers' age, experience and working hours,

driver training, driver working schedule, installation of safety devices, measures to monitor driving behaviour, vehicle examination, and measures to promote safety awareness of drivers and passengers. The Panel also proposed the following measures for the Administration's consideration –

- (a) Requirement of franchised bus operators to install seat belts on their buses, particularly on the more vulnerable seats;
- (b) Improvement of bus driver training;
- (c) Review and improvement of the working schedule and rest-break arrangements for bus captains; and
- (d) Conduct of more road safety publicity and education activities.

4. In May 2004, the Administration made a report to the Panel (LC Paper No. CB(1) 1955/03-04(01)) on the major findings of the above bus safety review, and the measures to further enhance bus safety worked out in the light of the recommendations of the Tuen Mun Road Traffic Incident Independent Expert Panel and the proposals made by the Panel. These proposed new measures included the introduction of annual medical check for drivers aged 50 or above, enhancement of training programmes for bus drivers, revision of the guidelines issued by TD to franchised bus operators on drivers' working hours (the Guidelines), installation of speed limiters and blackboxes on all new buses to be purchased, conduct of speed checks at critical locations, retrofitting of armrests at exposed seats, etc.

Discussion by the Panel on Transport

5. In the 2006-2007 session, the Panel held a series of meetings on 24 October 2006, 2 and 23 March 2007, and 9 July 2007 to follow up matters relating to franchised bus safety. The issue was also revisited on 28 January 2008, 22 February 2008 and 27 November 2009.

Installation and wearing of seat belts on buses

6. As a result of the spate of bus accidents that occurred during 2006-2007, which mostly involved passengers being thrown out from the window, the Panel strongly urged the Administration to seriously consider the proposal to introduce mandatory requirements for installation and wearing of passenger seat belts on franchised buses to enhance bus safety. At the Panel meeting on 24 October 2006, the Administration reported that it had been reviewing the feasibility of retrofitting seat belts on existing buses with franchised bus operators, taking into account such technical considerations as the structural strength of bus seats, the need for adequate anchorage points and design of the bus, etc.

7. At the meeting on 23 March 2007, the Panel passed a motion urging the Administration to immediately implement various improvement measures to enhance the safety of franchised bus operation, in particular those regarding seat belts.

8. The Administration subsequently conducted a research study on overseas practices regarding the fitting and wearing of seat belts in buses. The research findings revealed that the additional safety benefit of installing seat belts on all seats might not be as great as envisaged. Having regard to the professional advice of bus manufacturers, the Administration recommended in July 2007 that the following measures regarding seat belts be implemented –

- (a) To retrofit seat belt at the four seats on the first row on the upper deck of post-1997 design buses;
- (b) To install/add handrail, armrest or other facilities where appropriate for the other exposed seats to further enhance passenger safety during sharp acceleration/deceleration;
- (c) To install an additional horizontal guard rail across the upper deck windscreen of pre-1997 design buses for further protection to the front seat passengers;
- (d) To accord priority to the retrofitting of seat belt or installation of the additional guard rail on buses which operated on expressways;
- (e) To examine with the bus companies advancement of vehicle replacement programme to replace old buses earlier as far as their financial situation permitted; and
- (f) To ensure that new buses purchased by bus companies would have seat belts on all exposed seats.

9. The Administration briefed the Panel on the proposed new measures at the meeting on 9 July 2007. Some members considered the retrofitting and installation programme too long, and did not accept that additional horizontal guard rails should be installed across the upper deck windscreen of pre-1997 design buses in place of seat belts.

10. At the meeting on 27 November 2009, the Panel noted that all buses purchased after 2003 already had seat belts provided at the exposed seats. Seat belts had also been retrofitted at the front row on the upper deck of all post-1997 design buses. The works to install an additional horizontal guard rail across the upper deck windscreen of pre-1997 design buses had also completed to provide added protection to passengers. Some members, however, opined that the Administration should also draw up plans to provide seat belts at seats other than the exposed seats.

11. As to members' proposal of requiring passengers to wear seat belts where provided, the Administration has always advised that it had an open mind and was prepared to consider introducing this legislative requirement as and when the majority of franchised buses were fitted with seat belts for the exposed seats on the first row on the upper deck.

Review on working hours of bus captains

12. The Panel noted that TD revised the Guidelines in May 2004 to increase the minimum break for drivers between successive working days from eight to nine hours. Notwithstanding the improvement, some bus drivers and trade unions concerned complained in October 2004 that the franchised bus companies which they served forced drivers to operate buses of different models and run various routes every day. Moreover, they were not given reasonable time for meal and rest. On 29 October 2004, the Panel discussed with deputations from bus drivers their duty arrangements and implications on bus safety. Some members opined that a maximum duty length of 14 hours and driving duty of 11 hours, as allowed under the Guidelines, were too demanding. The Panel passed a motion urging the Administration to consider revising the Guidelines and reducing the above maximum duty and driving duty to 10 and eight hours respectively. The wording of the motion is in **Appendix I**.

13. The Panel further discussed bus drivers' working schedule at the meeting on 24 October 2006. The Panel also noted that a study conducted by the Department of Medicine and Therapeutics of the Chinese University of Hong Kong on a group of middle-aged commercial drivers revealed that about 61% and 24% of the interviewed bus drivers respectively admitted having daytime sleepiness and fallen asleep symptom when driving, and that six bus drivers who had been involved in traffic accidents revealed that the accidents were related to their sleepiness. Members urged the Administration to ensure that bus drivers would have sufficient rest time. Some members opined that the Guidelines should also be able to address the congestion problem along individual bus routes that would affect bus drivers' rest time in-between trips.

14. Taking into account the views of the Panel, bus captain unions and bus companies, the Administration reported at the Panel meeting on 9 July 2007 that the following revisions to the Guidelines had been made –

- (a) According to Guideline A, bus captains should have a break of at least 30 minutes after six hours of duty and within that 6-hour duty, the captains should have total service breaks of at least 20 minutes. While maintaining this requirement, it was further refined to stipulate that a rest time of at least 12 minutes in total should be within the first four hours of the duty; and
- (b) Guideline D on the break period between successive working days would be revised from the original 9 hours to no less than 9.5 hours.

The revised Guidelines incorporating the recommended revisions are in **Appendix II**. Some members, however, considered it undesirable that no revision had been made to the maximum duty and driving duty of 14 and 11 hours.

15. During discussion on the above revisions to the Guidelines at the Panel meeting on 28 January 2008, some members pointed out that, since some drivers might live in remote areas and spend a long time traveling to and from workplace, the improvement in paragraph 14(b) above might not ensure sufficient rest for bus captains. The Panel considered it necessary to further improve the Guidelines in consultation with bus drivers. The Panel met with representatives of the trade unions of bus companies on 22 February 2008 on the working hours and remuneration packages of bus captains, and whether these had any implications on the safety of franchised bus operations. Panel members noted bus drivers' concerns about route changes, bus maintenance arrangements, and their view that the revision in paragraph 14(a) above regarding a 12-minute rest every four hours should be increased to 15 to 20 minutes. The Administration advised that since the Guidelines had been revised in July 2007, a new round of revision exercise would be considered later.

16. On 9 November 2009, a serious bus accident occurred in Tseung Kwan O. The Panel revisited the issues about safety of bus operation at its meeting on 27 November 2009. Some members criticized the Administration for failing to ensure that bus drivers' working schedules were reasonable, and urged for remedial actions in respect of the following –

- (a) Bus drivers were sometimes required to serve unfamiliar routes or to drive the first trip of a day service of one route after having served the night service of another route (the route switch arrangement);
- (b) The meal break and rest break of drivers were sometimes merged, so that they could not have a break of at least 30 minutes after six hours of duty; and
- (c) There were not sufficient facilities at bus termini for drivers to take a rest.

17. Panel members reiterated the need to reduce the maximum working and driving hours specified under the Guidelines from 14 to 10, and from 11 to eight respectively. The break between successive working days of not less than 9.5 hours should also be extended to 12 hours, with one-hour meal break clearly provided under the Guidelines. They also urged TD to conduct under-cover operations of its own to ensure compliance with the Guidelines.

18. In response, the Administration advised that it was most important that a bus driver was familiar with the routes he served under the route switch

arrangement, and that the working hours would not exceed those specified in the Guidelines. The Administration had requested the bus companies concerned to propose improvements in response to the above complaints. TD also conducted whole-shift random on-board surveys on the working hour arrangements of bus drivers from time to time. The Administration further reported that bus companies had measures to enable bus drivers to be given rest time if any scheduled rest time had been reduced because of traffic congestion or other reasons. In particular, if the actual journey time of routes frequently exceeded the scheduled journey time due to genuine operational circumstances, the bus companies could apply to TD for adjusting the scheduled journey time. At members' request, the Administration agreed to review the Guidelines and to take the following actions –

- (a) Provide reports of the above whole-shift random on-board surveys on the working hour arrangements of bus drivers;
- (b) Respond in writing to the three submissions respectively from the KMB Staff Union, the Citybus Limited Employees Union and the New World First Bus Company Staff Union on bus drivers' duty arrangements; and
- (c) Provide figures on the wastage rate of bus drivers employed on contract terms.

The Administration's written responses [LC Paper No. CB(1)2265/09-10(01)-(03)] to the above three submissions were issued on 15 June 2010.

Design and construction of franchised bus

Bus body

19. The design and construction of franchised bus was also a major concern of the Panel because, in a number of bus accidents, the tops of the buses concerned were torn off, indicating the need for stronger bus body to provide greater protection to passengers. At the Panel meetings on 2 and 23 March 2007, the Administration assured members that the Road Traffic (Construction and Maintenance of Vehicles) Regulations (Cap. 374A) had stipulated the requirement for the design and construction of franchised bus. All double deck buses currently operating in Hong Kong were imported from Europe and could comply with the European requirements. The major bus manufacturers had also confirmed that the body structure of franchised buses in Hong Kong was the same as those supplied to other countries such as the United Kingdom, the United States and Singapore. The major double deck bus body supplier had further confirmed that the use of aluminum alloy on bus body had been an international trend in recent years, and that the use of material stronger than aluminum might not be good during accidents as it might cause other types of casualties. The Administration further pointed out that the rigidity of bus

structure relied mainly on the design. Optimum design using computerized analysis could achieve strength, reliability and stability. Notwithstanding, the Administration undertook to discuss with major bus body suppliers to further improve the body design to enhance safety.

20. In the aftermath of a serious bus accident in Tseung Kwan O on 14 December 2007, TD conducted an expert discussion forum on 10 January 2008 with academics, professional institutions, the bus manufacturer concerned and franchised bus companies to explore feasible measures to enhance the strength and safety of double deck buses. The bus manufacturer concerned put forward the following two proposals for consideration -

- (a) To strengthen the anchorage of the upper deck front three rows of seats by adding stronger plates and bolts on buses; and
- (b) To add an additional front guard rail which would be integrated with the body structure of the bus to further strengthen the body structure.

Bus windows

21. As a result of a spate of franchised bus incidents which involved broken windscreen and passengers being thrown away from the upper saloon of a bus after collision with another vehicle, the Panel discussed on 24 October 2006 measures to prevent the recurrence of similar incidents, including the selection of better materials for windscreen and passenger windows on buses. The Administration reported in March 2007 that it had agreed with franchised bus companies to apply a transparent protective film onto the upper deck toughened glass windscreens of all existing buses, which would effectively contain the shattered glass fragments in the event of an accident, or to replace them with laminated glass. The relevant modification/replacement works were scheduled for completion by mid-2008.

Installation of black boxes on buses and driver training and health

22. At the Panel meeting on 27 November 2009, the Administration reported that as at September 2009, about 70% of franchised buses were installed with black boxes. Bus companies were also studying ways to enhance random checks of the data retrieved from black boxes. When the record showed irregularities in journey time or when passengers' complaints on the driving behaviour of bus captains were received, the bus companies would investigate the cases using the data retrieved from black boxes.

23. The Panel also requested the Administration to ensure that refresher and enhancement courses would be provided to serving and new drivers to enhance their safety awareness. The Panel has also discussed whether the employment of drivers on contract terms and the work stress so arising would

affect their performance, and whether it would lead to brain drain not conducive to the retention of on-the-road practical experience. The Administration advised that according to the bus company concerned, the wastage rate of bus drivers employed on contract terms was low.

Restricting passengers from standing on double-deck buses operating on expressways

24. Some Panel members urged the Administration to review whether double-deck buses should be allowed to operate on expressways in Hong Kong given their higher risks and if so, whether standing passengers should be allowed on them. The Administration advised that the standing capacity of a bus accounted for some 30% of its carrying capacity. The above proposal would have implications on the number of buses required and the fares, and required examination of whether there was sufficient justification for the restriction.

25. The Panel had requested the Research and Library Services Division of the Secretariat to conduct a research on whether overseas countries allowed standing passengers on buses operating on expressways and the measures taken to address the safety of standing passengers. The research report was issued on 18 April 2008 vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1307/07-08. As proposed by some Panel members at the meeting on 28 January 2008, academics and professionals' views in this regard were also sought and views from The Hong Kong Productivity Council, Ir K K LO, Department of Mechanical Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Community for Road Safety and The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers were received and circulated to member vide LC Papers Nos. CB(1)873/07-08 and CB(1)1180/07-08 on 21 February and 2 April 2008 respectively.

Bus fire/smoke incidents

26. In response to public concern about the three franchised bus fire/smoke incidents on 10 December 2008, the Panel discussed the safeguards against recurrence of similar incidents with the Administration and the franchised bus companies concerned at its meeting on 23 January 2009. While the Administration advised that the three incidents were not due to maintenance deficiency and all were isolated incidents, members remained concerned about the adequacy of the existing maintenance programme for buses. Some members expressed concern about whether the bus companies concerned had cut resources for their maintenance programmes.

27. The Administration advised that it had obtained the bus companies' confirmation that there had been no reduction in maintenance resources in recent years. The Administration also undertook to step up surprise spot checks of buses operating on the road to ensure the quality of bus maintenance. The Administration would continue to closely monitor the servicing and maintenance

programmes of franchised buses and to hold regular meetings with bus operators to review bus examination results. Measures required to be taken by bus operators to safeguard against smoke/fire incidents were detailed in **Appendix III**.

28. The Administration further reported that TD had been working with the bus companies and bus manufacturers to explore installing automatic fire extinguishers and strengthening the fire protection zone with a view to further enhancing the safety of franchised bus operation. At the suggestion of Panel members, the bus companies undertook to strengthen the conduct of bus fire drills to ensure safe evacuation of passengers. The Administration's report on causes of the above bus fire/smoke incidents and recommendations on preventive measures was provided to the Panel in April 2009 [LC Paper No. CB(1)1476/08-09(01)].

Latest development

29. The Administration has proposed to discuss the safety of bus operation at the Panel meeting on 28 June 2010.

Relevant papers

30. A list of relevant papers is at **Appendix IV**.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
25 June 2010

Panel on Transport
Motion on "Safety of franchised bus operations" passed at the meeting on
29 October 2004

"本會強烈要求運輸署研究修訂以下巴士車長編更指引：

- (1) 一天內最長的工作時間(包括所有休息時間)由不應超逾14小時減至10小時；
- (2) 一天內的駕駛時間(即最長的工作時間減去所有30分鐘或以上的休息時間)由不應超逾11小時減至8小時；
- (3) 車長食飯時間不應偏離人體正常生理時鐘；及
- (4) 編更路綫不少於7天前發給車長。藉以加強專營巴士服務營運安全。"

(English Translation)

"This Panel strongly urges the Administration to study revising the Guidelines on Working Schedule for Bus Drivers so that :

- (a) maximum duty (including all breaks) should be reduced from not exceeding 14 hours to not exceeding 10 hours;
- (b) driving duty (i.e. maximum duty minus all breaks of 30 minutes or more) should be reduced from not exceeding 11 hours to not exceeding 8 hours;
- (c) meal time schedule for drivers should not deviate from normal human biological clocks; and
- (d) schedules for driving routes should be given to bus drivers seven days in advance, to enhance the safety of franchised bus service operations."

Guidelines on Bus Captain Working Hours

(Revised in July 2007)

- Guideline A
 - Bus captains should have a break of at least 30 minutes after 6 hours of duty and within that 6-hour duty, the bus captains should have total service breaks of at least 20 minutes of which no less than 12 minutes should be within the first 4 hours of the duty.
- Guideline B
 - Maximum duty (including all breaks) should not exceed 14 hours in a day.
- Guideline C
 - Driving duty (i.e. maximum duty minus all breaks of 30 minutes or more) should not exceed 11 hours in a day.
- Guideline D
 - Break between successive working days should not be less than 9.5 hours.

Source: LC Paper No. CB(1)2023/06-07(03)

**Measures required to be taken by bus operators
to safeguard against smoke/fire incidents**

All bus operators have taken the following measures to safeguard against smoke/fire incidents –

New Buses :

- (a) to ensure hoseless design configuration in the engine compartment as far as practicable;
- (b) to include better fire retardancy standard in materials specification; and
- (c) to adopt proven designs against potential fire hazards as far as possible;

Existing Buses :

- (a) to re-route hoses, cables and other heat-susceptible components away from heat sources as far as practicable;
- (b) to replace critical components that might become potential fire hazards on failure according to the maintenance schedule;
- (c) to equip protective sleeve for oil hoses/electrical cable as and when required;
- (d) to review potential fire/smoke hazards and make modifications via internal feedback and modification trials; and
- (e) to issue maintenance notices advocating maintenance best practice and procedures that help to safeguard against fire hazards in an ongoing manner.

2. Every serving bus has to undergo annual examination by TD to ensure its safety and roadworthiness. Furthermore, TD conducts random spot checks to ensure that the buses are maintained properly. The fire-fighting equipments installed in the buses are examined during these annual and spot checks to ensure that they are in good condition and function properly. TD closely monitors the servicing and maintenance programmes of the franchised buses and holds regular meetings with the bus operators to discuss bus examination results and, where appropriate, to formulate measures to enhance bus safety.

3. On top of ensuring the standards of buses, all operators also provide different types of training to their new and serving bus captains to enhance their safety awareness. Procedures in handling emergency and evacuation of passengers are compulsory parts of the training programme which includes not only classroom training but also practical drills. The emergency handling procedures, such as steps for bus captains to facilitate safe evacuation of passengers from a bus on fire, are listed in the bus captains' handbooks/circulars. The bus operators review and enhance the handbooks/circulars from time to time.

Source: LC Paper No. CB(1)466/08-09(01)

Appendix IV

Safety of franchised bus operation

List of relevant papers

| Date of meeting | Committee | Minutes / Paper | LC Paper No. |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|---|
| 28.11.2003 | Panel on Transport | <p>Administration's paper on "Measures to enhance the safety of franchised bus operation"</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> <p>Report on Franchised Bus Operators' Review of Arrangements to Enhance Safety of Franchised Bus Operation</p> | <p>CB(1)406/03-04(04)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/tp/papers/tp1128cb1-406-4e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)589/03-04</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp031128.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)1955/03-04(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr03-04/english/panels/tp/papers/tpcb1-1955-1e.pdf</p> |
| 29.10.2004 | Panel on Transport | <p>Administration's paper on "Safety of franchised bus operations"</p> <p>Background brief on work arrangements for drivers of franchised bus companies prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat</p> <p>Submission from the New World First Bus Company Staff Union</p> <p>Submission from the Citybus Limited Employees Union</p> | <p>CB(1)111/04-05(05)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/tp/papers/tp1029cb1-111-5e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)112/04-05</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/tp/papers/tp1029cb1-112-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)111/04-05(03)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/chinese/panels/tp/papers/tp1029cb1-111-3c-scan.pdf (Chinese version only)</p> <p>CB(1)127/04-05(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/chinese/panels/tp/papers/tp1029cb1-127-1c-scan.pdf (Chinese version only)</p> |

| Date of meeting | Committee | Minutes / Paper | LC Paper No. |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Submission from the Motor Transport Workers General Union City Bus Branch</p> <p>Submission from the Motor Transport Workers General Union New World First Bus Branch</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> | <p>CB(1)111/04-05(04)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/chinese/panels/tp/papers/tp1029cb1-111-4c-scan.pdf (Chinese version only)</p> <p>CB(1)111/04-05(07)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/chinese/panels/tp/papers/tp1029cb1-111-7c-scan.pdf (Chinese version only)</p> <p>CB(1)286/04-05</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr04-05/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp041029.pdf</p> |
| 24.10.2006 | Panel on Transport | <p>Administration's paper on "Safety of franchised bus operations"</p> <p>Background brief on safety of franchised bus operations prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> | <p>CB(1)110/06-07(03)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/tp/papers/tp1024cb1-110-3-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)113/06-07</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/tp/papers/tp1024cb1-113-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)294/06-07</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp061024.pdf</p> |
| 28.2.2007 | Council meeting | Hon LI Fung-ying raised a question on Safety of window panes of franchised buses | <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/counmtg/hansard/cm0228-translate-e.pdf</p> |
| 2.3.2007 | Panel on Transport | <p>Administration's paper on "Progress on measures to enhance safety of franchised bus operation"</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> | <p>CB(1)783/06-07(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0126cb1-783-1-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)1147/06-07</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp070302.pdf</p> |

| Date of meeting | Committee | Minutes / Paper | LC Paper No. |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|--|
| 23.3.2007 | Panel on Transport | <p>Administration's paper on "Progress on measures to enhance safety of franchised bus operation"</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> | <p>CB(1)1149/06-07(03)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0323cb1-1149-3-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)1407/06-07</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp070323.pdf</p> |
| 9.7.2007 | Panel on Transport | <p>Administration's paper on "Progress on Measures to Enhance Safety of Franchised Bus Operation "</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> | <p>CB(1)2023/06-07(03)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0709cb1-2023-3-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)2408/06-07</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr06-07/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp070709.pdf</p> |
| 16.1.2008 | Council meeting | Hon Albert CHENG raised a question on structural safety of franchised buses | <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/counmtg/hansard/cm0116-translate-e.pdf</p> |
| 28.1.2008 | Panel on Transport | <p>Administration's paper on "Safety of franchised bus operation"</p> <p>Updated background brief on safety of franchised bus operation prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> <p>Paper on whether passengers are allowed to stand on buses operating on expressways in selected overseas places prepared by the Research and Library Services Division [IN12/07/08]</p> | <p>CB(1)639/07-08(03)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0128cb1-639-3-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)631/07-08</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0128cb1-631-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)838/07-08</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp080128.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)1307/07-08</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/sec/library/0708in12-e.pdf</p> |

| Date of meeting | Committee | Minutes / Paper | LC Paper No. |
|-----------------|--------------------|--|---|
| 22.2.2008 | Panel on Transport | <p>Administration's paper on "Safety of franchised bus operation"</p> <p>Updated background brief on safety of franchised bus operation prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat</p> <p>Submission from the Motor Transport Workers General Union K.M.B. Branch</p> <p>Submission from Motor Transport Workers General Union L.W.B. Branch</p> <p>Submission from the Motor Transport Workers General Union New World Bus Branch</p> <p>Submission from the Motor Transport Workers General Union City Bus Branch</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> | <p>CB(1)639/07-08(03)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0128cb1-639-3-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)631/07-08</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0128cb1-631-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)827/07-08(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/chinese/panels/tp/papers/tp0222cb1-827-1-c.pdf (Chinese version only)</p> <p>CB(1)827/07-08(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/chinese/panels/tp/papers/tp0222cb1-827-1-c.pdf (Chinese version only)</p> <p>CB(1)827/07-08(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/chinese/panels/tp/papers/tp0222cb1-827-1-c.pdf (Chinese version only)</p> <p>CB(1)827/07-08(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/chinese/panels/tp/papers/tp0222cb1-827-1-c.pdf (Chinese version only)</p> <p>CB(1)1123/07-08</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp080222.pdf</p> |
| 23.1.2009 | Panel on Transport | Administration's paper on "Recent bus fire/smoke incidents" | <p>CB(1)614/08-09(05)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0123cb1-614-5-e.pdf</p> |

| Date of meeting | Committee | Minutes / Paper | LC Paper No. |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Administration's paper on "Report on the bus fire/smoke incidents on 10 December 2008 "</p> <p>Administration's paper on "Update on review of recent bus fire incidents"</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> <p>Administration's paper on "Investigation reports on the bus fire/smoke incidents on 10 December 2008"</p> <p>Administration's paper on "Recent bus fire/smoke incidents"</p> | <p>CB(1)466/08-09(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0123cb1-466-1-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)1986/07-08(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr07-08/english/panels/tp/papers/tpcb1-1986-1-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)1362/08-09</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp20090123.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)749/08-09(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0123cb1-749-1-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)1476/08-09(01)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr08-09/english/panels/tp/papers/tp0123cb1-1476-1-e.pdf</p> |
| 27.11.2009 | Panel on Transport | <p>Administration's paper on "Bus accident in Tseung Kwan O and safety of franchised bus operation"</p> <p>Submission from the New World First Bus Company Staff Union (Restricted to Members)</p> <p>Relevant press cuttings (Restricted to Members)</p> <p>Minutes of meeting</p> | <p>CB(1)430/09-10(06)</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/tp/papers/tp1127cb1-430-6-e.pdf</p> <p>CB(1)489/09-10(02) (Chinese version only)</p> <p>CB(1)430/09-10(07)</p> <p>CB(1)1188/09-10</p> <p>http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/panels/tp/minutes/tp20091127.pdf</p> |