

Panel on Transport

List of follow-up actions (position as at 25 June 2010)

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
1. Safety of reversing goods vehicles	25 May 2007	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information to the Panel –</p> <p>(a) A monthly update on the progress of the improvement works on the 132 priority road sections identified in consultation with District Councils for detailed investigations on measures that could be implemented to enhance the safety of reversing vehicles; and</p> <p>(b) The number of goods vehicles which had technical difficulties in installing reversing video devices and those which did not have such difficulties.</p>	<p>The requested monthly updates were issued vide LC Papers Nos. CB(1)1970/06-07, CB(1)2177/06-07, CB(1)2294/06-07, CB(1)2386/06-07, CB(1)99/07-08, CB(1)298/07-08 and CB(1)491/07-08 on 22 June, 23 July, 22 August, 24 September, 22 October, 21 November and 21 December 2007 respectively.</p> <p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>
2. Central Kowloon Route (CKR) - Progress update	27 February 2009	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information to the Panel –</p>	<p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
		<p>(a) A paper detailing the measures to be taken to mitigate the air and noise impacts that might be caused by the Western Tunnel Portal of CKR to local residents including Prosperous Garden residents; and</p> <p>(b) A paper on the estimated noise impacts in terms of decibels as a result of construction of the CKR project, the noise pollution level at the Ferry Street Flyover (FSF) sections fronting Prosperous Garden, explanation of the technical difficulties in retrofitting these sections with noise barriers and why those difficulties could not be overcome, as well as details of the alternative mitigation measures under contemplation and the estimated mitigation effect expected to be achieved in terms of reduced decibels. The paper should also address the point that CKR might increase traffic flow on these sections of FSF and aggravate the noise problem, so that mitigation measures such as the installation of double-glazed windows and air-conditioning for the affected residents should be considered.</p>	

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
3. Recent fatal traffic accident in Mong Kok and safety of public light buses (PLBs)	26 June 2009	The Administration was requested to submit reports at quarterly intervals on relevant issues including measures to enhance road safety and specific measures for PLBs, in particular progress made by the Administration in exploring the installation of “blackbox” (i.e. a vehicle monitoring system) and speed limiter; and statistics of law enforcement and undercover operations conducted against speeding of PLB drivers and the justifications behind as appropriate.	The first quarterly report was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)430/09-10(03) on 20 November 2009.
4. Review of Fare Adjustment Arrangement for Franchised Buses	23 October 2009	To ensure that the bus-bus interchange (BBI) schemes for new towns could really meet residents' needs for bus service, and that section fares would be implemented to keep fares affordable, the Administration was urged to conduct an overall review in this regard and provide a paper to the Panel.	The Administration agreed to consider the request.
5. Measures to enhance safety of public light bus (PLB) operation	27 November 2009	<p>The Administration was requested to provide the following information to the Panel –</p> <p>(a) Figures on the actual working hours of green minibus drivers ;</p> <p>(b) The Administration's views on the 11-hour daily driving duty for PLB drivers, and a comparison table of</p>	<p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p> <p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
		<p>their working hours with their counterparts overseas; and</p> <p>(c) Figures on prosecution actions against the triad infiltration in PLB operation, and extortion of money from red minibus drivers in the name of "terminal fees" or "operating fee".</p>	<p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>
<p>6. Further discussion on changes made by MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) to staff welfare</p>	<p>27 November 2009</p>	<p>MTRCL was requested to provide to the Panel a detailed paper on outsourcing, listing the services and job categories outsourced in the past, at present and in future; the staff cost of the management and of the frontline staff; and rail incidents in the past three years together with the job categories involved. In the above outsourcing paper, a comparison of the staff turnover rate of MTRCL and those of its contractors should be provided.</p>	<p>Information from MTRCL is awaited</p>
<p>7. Recent bus accident in Tseung Kwan O and safety of franchised bus operation</p>	<p>27 November 2009</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to take the following actions –</p> <p>(a) Provide reports of the whole-shift random on-board surveys on the working hour arrangements of bus drivers conducted by the Transport Department from time to time, and details on how the surveys were</p>	<p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
		<p>conducted;</p> <p>(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; and</p> <p>(c) Provide figures on the wastage rate of bus drivers employed on contract terms.</p>	<p>The Administration's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)2265/09-10 on 15 June 2010.</p> <p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>
<p>9. Improving pedestrian environment</p>	<p>22 January 2010</p>	<p>The Administration agreed to provide further details on the underground conditions of Causeway Bay to show the spots along Great George Street to Leighton Road where underground shops could be accommodated.</p>	<p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>
<p>10. Rationalization of bus routes to improve air quality</p>	<p>22 January 2010</p>	<p>The Administration was requested to take the following actions –</p> <p>(a) To provide figures to substantiate that if section fares were offered as proposed and more short-haul passengers were induced to ride on long-haul buses, the frequency of these long-haul buses might need to be increased to the detriment of bus</p>	<p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
		<p>operation efficiency and the environment;</p> <p>(b) To provide a written response to members' proposals below:</p> <p>(1) The proposal to actively explore various suggested enhanced incentives such as section fares, interchange discounts for routes operated by different bus companies, competition among the 18 districts, replacement of cancelled bus services with green-minibus services; and</p> <p>(2) The proposal to expedite the bus replacement programme; and</p> <p>(c) To provide a paper on how the Administration intended to proceed with a view to forming a cross-district and cross-party consensus on the implementation of bus rationalization.</p>	<p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p> <p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>
<p>11. Assessment results on proposals for provision of hillside escalator links and</p>	<p>26 February 2010</p>	<p>At the meeting, the Panel passed the following three motions –</p>	<p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
elevator systems		<p>(a) "That this Panel urges the Government to include all the districts covered by the 18 proposals for 'provision of hillside escalator links and elevator systems' in its feasibility studies in this regard.";</p> <p>(b) "That this Panel strongly requests the Government to immediately conduct feasibility studies on all the '20 proposed hillside escalator and elevator systems' which have been assessed 'based on the assessment system'. "; and</p> <p>(c) "That this Panel strongly requests the Government to increase the maximum score for the evaluation criterion of 'existing population of 65 year-old or above within catchment' under the assessment system for provision of hillside escalator links and elevator systems, so as to benefit areas with an aging population."</p> <p>The Administration was requested to provide a response to the above motions.</p>	
12. Traffic and transport arrangements in South	23 April 2010	At the meeting, the Panel passed the following motion –	The Administration's response to the motion was issued vide

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
Lantau including Tung Chung Road		<p>"That (this Panel) urges the Government to abolish the quota system for tour coaches for Lantau so as to facilitate the development of local tourism economy. "</p> <p>The Administration was requested to provide a response to the above motion.</p>	<p>LC Paper No. CB(1)2226/09-10(01) on 11 June 2010.</p>
13. Review on ferry services for outlying islands	23 April 2010	<p>The Administration was requested to take the following actions –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Explain more about the safeguards to prevent abuses of Government subsidy when the relevant funding proposal was submitted to the Finance Committee (FC); (b) Provide before submitting the relevant funding proposal to FC for consideration a paper on the financial implications of the option of continuing the ferry services by Government purchasing the vessels itself and contracting out their daily operation to private operators, taking into account the annual maintenance costs as well; (c) Analyze the financial implications of each of the options that had been 	<p>Information from the Administration is awaited</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
		<p>explored but not adopted as highlighted in paragraphs 13(a) to 13(e) of the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(1)1648/09-10(04)], in particular the option on Government purchasing vessels for operators in paragraph 13(c), and to provide a comparison of these explored options with the two new proposals to facilitate members' consideration. In presenting the financial implications of the two new proposals highlighted in the Administration's paper, the Administration should also explain the financial implications of each of the existing helping measures listed in Annex B to the same paper from the Administration.</p>	
<p>14. Proposed fare increase by the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL)</p>	<p>23 April 2010</p>	<p>The Administration/MTRCL agreed to take the following actions –</p> <p>(a) The Administration agreed that MTRCL would provide information on fares with rate of increase higher than the overall fare adjustment rate within the permitted range;</p>	<p>The Administration/MTRCL's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1961/09-10 on 19 May 2010.</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
		<p>(b) The Administration to arrange for MTRCL to provide to the Panel a paper, listing out all existing fare promotions and whether they would be continued, and all additional fare promotions, if any, that would be introduced when the 2010 fare adjustment took effect;</p> <p>(c) MTRCL to advise as soon as practicable whether fare concessions, such as the "Ride-10-Get-One-Free" fare concession, monthly travel passes that were valid among various railway lines, elderly fare concessions, etc would be continued/provided when the 2010 fare adjustment took effect, so as to enable members to ascertain how effective the Administration had been in encouraging MTRCL to provide fare concessions;</p> <p>(d) MTRCL to exercise care to ensure that notwithstanding the 2010 fare adjustment, increases in the fares of railway lines serving remote new towns such as Tung Chung and Tin Shui Wai would be minimized; and</p>	<p>The Administration/MTRCL's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1961/09-10 on 19 May 2010.</p> <p>The Administration/MTRCL's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1961/09-10 on 19 May 2010.</p> <p>The Administration/MTRCL's response was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1961/09-10 on 19 May 2010.</p>

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
		(e) MTRCL to respond to the complaint that the fare for going from Tai Wai to Mong Kok was \$7, which was 42% higher than the \$4.9 from Tai Wai to Mong Kok East.	Information from MTRCL is awaited
15. Rationalization of bus routes to improve air quality	28 May 2010	<p>The Administration was requested to take the following actions –</p> <p>(a) Follow up with the relevant District Councils on the route cancellation/amalgamation proposals regarding routes 234S, 69X, N237 and 962X, and report back on the outcomes;</p> <p>(b) Improve the present guidelines on service improvement and reduction in Bus Route Development Programmes by incorporating additional guidelines proposed by members at the meeting, such as the availability of fare concessions in return, the need to ensure environmental benefits would result, that there should be special treatment if the areas concerned were remote or were mostly populated by elderly persons, that the job security of bus drivers should not be adversely affected,</p>	Information from the Administration is awaited

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up action required	Latest position / Administration's response
		etc.; (c) Provide a paper to explain how low emission zones would be implemented, particularly in relation to bus replacement and bus route cancellation/amalgamation; and (d) Provide information on the alternatives available if bus replacement could not be expedited, in particular a comparison of the environmental benefits and financial implications concerned.	

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
25 June 2010