

## Comment comment information

2015-11-20 ▾ 2016-03-18 ▾



Record List (total records: 555)

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
1144	<p>請問政府以什麼準則決定是否有需要推行ERP？將來衡量ERP計劃是否有成效，是否用同一準則？如果成效不明顯，會否立即終止計劃？</p> <p>現時港九不少地區都有類似中環的塞車情況，為什麼不考慮ERP？那是不公平！</p> <p>很多在中環經營的小型企業，極需小型客貨車，甚或私人小汽車，每天不止一次的出入中環，那是運作上的需要，為什麼要他們在ERP下承擔更多開支，這也是不公平！</p> <p>中環人</p>		2016-03-18 23:54:27

W00555

W00554

<p>1143</p>	<p>在實施「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」以前，大前還是加強執法行動，嚴打老闊車違例泊車，必須在整個交通流量高的時段內嚴密執法！不可定時收手，同時切實研究推行「中環行人及單車專用區」。</p> <p><b>收費區</b></p> <p>1 「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費區，東起花園道及干諾道中，南以皇后大道中為界，西抵摩利臣街，北達干諾道中，因為造成鄰近地區交通擠塞是因車輛排隊進入中環商業中心區；如果收費成功減少車輛進入中環商業中心區的意欲，也會減少鄰近地區道路擠塞。</p> <p>2 不同意鄰近中環的其他地區，包括金鐘或上環的部分地方，納入「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」內。</p> <p><b>收費機制</b></p> <p>3 我認為「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」應採用同界為本收費機制，並效「新加坡計劃」避免車輛在收費區內作不必要車程，因為更能符合「用者自付」的原則。</p> <p><b>收費時段</b></p> <p>4 我認同「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」須在交通流量高的時段內收費。</p> <p>5 我認同「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」不須在星期日及公眾假期收費。</p> <p><b>收費水平</b></p> <p>6 我認為「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」應根據車輛的載客量收取不同費用（即載客量較高的車輛可付較低的費用）。</p> <p>7 如果某路線離開收費區由遠至近有三個收費點，則每次經過收費點應分別收 5至50港元不等，並按駛經時間和行車方向徵收不同費用，能令駕駛者改變其駕駛行為。</p> <p><b>豁免和優惠</b></p> <p>8 除緊急車輛外，我強力要求「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」豁免向區內居民及接載殘障人士的車輛收取費用，因為他們沒有其他選擇，收取他們費用不公平。</p> <p><b>科技</b></p> <p>9 整體而言，採用短距離微波通訊科技可節省因需安排大量人手來核對車牌影像而增加的運作成本。</p> <p><b>對私隱的關注</b></p> <p>10 我關注「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的私隱保護：路邊拍攝的車牌影像被不當獲取使用，需立法保障無須留為跟蹤的資料立即刪除。</p> <p><b>成效</b></p> <p>11 若「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」推行後，交通流量減少15%，平均車速增加24%，可算達標。</p> <p>12 同意要定期檢討「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的成效，以決定是否繼續實施計劃，並調整收費水平以維持其成效。</p> <p><b>配套設施</b></p> <p>13 我認為「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」需要大量增加泊車設施等配套設施。</p> <p>市民 王潔益 ( )</p>		<p>2016-03-18 23:42:51</p>
<p>1142</p>	<p>反對。 - 巴士太多 - 違泊老細車太多，佔了道路，警方執法不力 - 加強違泊罰碼</p>		<p>2016-03-18 23:37:07</p>

W00553

W00552

1141	<p>I don't agree with any ERP scheme to be initiated in any areas of Hong Kong at all. The traffic in Hong Kong has been a big problem since the late 70's; many politicians initiated various programs, from raising import tax on cars to raising annual license registration fee to raising tunnel fee, to try to resolve the problem in the past. Traffic congestion has gotten worse because these fee based programs failed miserably! Obviously, increasing in fees can never solve the traffic problem.</p> <p>The traffic problem is caused by the lack of urban planning in Hong Kong. Toll charges for using tunnels and bridges are too expensive, new high rise buildings are not required to provide ample on-site parking to the public, the redevelopment of a district fails to prioritize the parking issue and virtually nothing is done to stop the illegal occupation of the limited traffic space and non metered parking spaces in the streets by the businesses throughout Hong Kong.</p> <p>To help mitigate the traffic congestion problem, Hong Kong can:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Reduce current toll charges for all tunnels and bridges by 50%, this will encourage drivers to pay the reasonable tolls and utilize all uncongested routes.</li><li>2. Replace all toll plazas with automated cameras to record the license plate numbers. This will reduce the congestion at the entrance or exit of each toll tunnel or bridge. Drivers will have 7 days to pay online or in person. Please see the following link for reference <a href="https://www.nzta.govt.nz/roads-and-rail/toll-roads/toll-road-information/how-electronic-tolling-works/">https://www.nzta.govt.nz/roads-and-rail/toll-roads/toll-road-information/how-electronic-tolling-works/</a></li><li>3. Construct several new toll free suspended bridges between Hong Kong Island and Kowloon to help move the traffic. Please see this link for reference <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bridges_of_Pittsburgh">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bridges_of_Pittsburgh</a></li><li>4. Enact new building codes to ensure ample on-site parking with low hourly rate is available for the public in all new or renovated buildings.</li><li>5. Substantial fine should be issued immediately to those business owners who use the traffic space and non-metered public parking spaces to conduct their daily business. Those spaces are reserved for the righteous car owners who pay for the annual registration license fees to use.</li></ol>	2016-03-18 22:36:55
------	--	------------------------

W00551

1140	'1.	2016-03-18 22:04:42
------	-----	------------------------

W00550

1139	<p>Consultation on Electronic Road Pricing Pilot Scheme (ERPS)</p> <p>Overlook the need of our Residents who live in Robinson Place No matter the resident use public transport or private vehicles, easy access to central is essential to them. Our residents who travel to Central to work and make a living everyday. Please consider the Electronic Road Pricing Pilot Scheme is serious ramifications on the travel pattern of residents in mid-Levels (eg, Robinson Place).</p> <p>Reintroduce some modes of public transport of Mid-Levels Before any launching of ERPS the Government should either reintroduce some modes of public transport from Mid-levels to from central, or grant certain exemptions, such as free entry of our residents private vehicles to Central for one trip a day etc.</p> <p>Reinstatement of Bus route 3B The Government and the service providers had completely ignored the need of residents in western Mid-levels, please consider to restore the bus route 3B.</p> <p>From Robinson Place Management Office</p>	2016-03-18 17:30:49
------	---	------------------------

W00549

1138	不贊成	2016-03-18 17:00:01
------	-----	------------------------

W00548

1137 In my personal opinion, as a Hong Kong citizen, I think the scheme of Electronic Road Pricing (ERP) should be implemented to Hong Kong.

With the completion of Central-Wanchai Bypass which will provide road users travel to the west of Hong Kong Island from the rest of the Island without passing through Central, ERP can focus to the trips to and from Central.

For charging area, as a pilot scheme, the charging area can be Central only. When it finds the scheme successful after implementation, the area can be enlarged to its neighboring areas such as Admiralty and Wan Chai.

I think the volume of private vehicles and taxis will be the main targets to be reduced. On the other hand, the public road transports including buses, minibuses should be exempted for the charging for their large capacities. Moreover, the charging may be transferred to the public transport users. It is unfair to those who do not really contribute to but suffer from the congestion. Of course, all emergency vehicles should be exempted.

As the main focus of the Scheme is to resolve the congestion problem in weekdays, the charging period should not include public holidays and weekends, unless there is any serious congestion problems at those periods.

HK is almost the first place in the world to discuss the implementation of ERP. However, the scheme have not launched until this moment while the congestion problem is not improved while similar schemes are successful in many other cities. I agree ERP should be launched at the completion of Central-Wanchai Bypass.

2016-03-18 16:59:34

W00547

1136 Designing a scheme that is 'revenue neutral' is one strategy that can be used to gain public support, however this can be difficult to achieve in practice. There are likely to be winners and losers in any road pricing scheme. Pressure to provide concessions to certain road user groups can reduce revenue and weaken other objectives of a pricing scheme at the same time.

Any revenue goals should be clearly identified from the outset as these can influence the way that a scheme is designed.

Under the current political situation without any trusts among all stakeholders, to implement any ERP or road charging scheme, it will certainly fail. To save the effort and avoid any future conflict in LegCo's debate, not to proceed further is the right and correct choice.

2016-03-18 16:12:50

W00546

1135 中區交通擠塞問題困擾香港多年，亦令行車時間大幅延長。電子道路收費計劃相信能減少私家車使用該區道路，從而舒緩交通問題。本人認為商界為本及指定時間只收一次的收費模式較為合適，若收費是視乎車輛逗留時間則更佳，可杜絕車輛於收費區逗留。另外收費時間亦應在交通流量高峰時才收，而星期日及公眾假期不收。至於收費模式則應根據車輛大小而定，因為大型車輛對交通擠塞影響較大，相信按次收費會較能令駕駛者減少使用該區道路。車輛豁免方面，本人覺得公共交通如巴士小巴應可獲豁免，除了鼓勵市民使用公共交通工具外，亦免去巴士小巴難以加價，另外我認為電車亦應獲豁免，因為電車對交通擠塞影響甚少。正如文中提及，短距離渡輪需要為駕駛人士一次過安裝硬件，但長遠以言省去人手，而該科技亦有其他用途，因此較好，亦減少關於私隱問題。

2016-03-18 16:08:00

W00545

1134 電子道路收費未必能解決交通擠塞問題，較有效的辦法可能是禁止某些車輛進入，不然收費最終只會增加有關市民的負擔，令民怨加重。

政府應該致力改善車多路少引致嚴重擠塞問題，而非用錢來增加市民負擔來解決問題。

2016-03-18 16:03:42

W00544

1133 政府的中區電子道路收費計劃是非必要的。

當局應先加強打擊非法泊車的力度。

2016-03-18 16:02:34

W00543

1132 I oppose the scheme. It's solving the wrong problem, and will do so in a way that impacts the public.

Congestion is because there are a lack of legal car parking spaces in Hong Kong, and the parking laws are not being enforced adequately. Rather than park legally, cars loiter on streets, or circulate slowly, jamming the streets. That is the cause of congestion.

The solution to the problem is straightforward- Firstly the government needs to set aside more space for carparks. Unfortunately, instead of facilitation the growth of car parking spaces, the government has been destroying them The middle road carpark was demolished in heavily congested Tsim Sha Tsui.

Secondly, the parking laws need to be enforced. Cameras and other technologies can be applied towards this instead of electronic road pricing.

Thirdly, the government should consider signage that provides information to motorists on the availability of carparking spaces. This has been done very effectively in Singapore with electronic signboards that show all carparks within a region.

The Electronic Road Pricing proposal is completely inappropriate for several reasons.

Firstly, the proposal is for the wrong place. Traffic speeds are not slowing on Hong Kong island ( As Figure 1.1 in the report clearly shows ) Yet, the "fix" is being applied on Hong Kong Island. I can only imagine that since London imposed ERP on the CBD the HK government has decided to copy this.

Secondly, unlike other locations where ERP has been used, Hong Kong has a large number of essential services located within the ERP zone. Libraries, concert halls, schools, cathedrals, marriage registries, doctors, government offices, law courts, etcetera. Its quite easy for a normal citizen to avoid travelling to London's ERP; but that is NOT that case for Hong Kong. ERP will become a hardship for residents of Hong Kong island who find them selves forced to cross the harbor to access basic services or pay ERP.

Thirdly, no work has been done to test the elasticity of pricing, although the study does contemplate the necessity of raising pricing. The fact the ERP prices have been raised multiple times in London is proof that ERP does not really change behavior much for very wealthy motorists. It's unlikely the wealthy of Hong Kong will change their driving habits; cars will continue to loiter and block the streets, while escalating ERP charges will be a hardship to the non wealthy of Hong Kong. ERP will become a nothing more than a new tax that solves nothing.

2016-03-18 14:19:14

W00542	1131	反對道路收費，影響小市民生計		2016-03-18 11:33:38
W00541	1130	不同意		2016-03-18 11:26:31
W00540	1129	Support		2016-03-18 10:42:47
W00539	1128	<p>1. I sense some confusion as to whether the target is congestion or pollution. Unlike many cities, Hong Kong is blessed with a very modern range of private cars which produce far less pollution than older vehicles. Also, though I travel to Central frequently I never do so at peak hours. My observation is that outside peak hours the number of taxis, buses and goods vehicles on the roads in Central far outweighs the number of cars.</p> <p>2. Why is Central being targeted? I always consider Tsimshatsui to be far worse. In any event it would be outrageous to introduce erp in that area before the Central by-pass has been opened.</p> <p>3. It is a personal opinion but I do consider Admiralty to be part of Central. ( My office used to be in Pacific Place ). I do not consider Sheung Wan to be "Central". I cannot help but again wonder why Central / Admiralty is being targeted. A few years ago we had an incredible opportunity to dramatically reduce the numbers of workers in Central / Admiralty by moving Government offices to , possibly , Kai Tak. Our Government rejected this chance. I have always regretted that decision. It would seem that congestion / pollution was not a concern that short time ago.</p> <p>4. What is happening with planning anyway? There are widespread complaints about illegal parking ( quite rightly ) BUT we are now told that the Murray Road car park is to be lost. How can such a strange decision be made UNLESS there is a clause requiring the developer to include public car parking in the redevelopment? If that is so then this point is withdrawn.</p> <p>5. I accept that I may well not be typical but I frequently pay approx HK\$3,000 per month in tunnel fees. I consider that a type of electronic road pricing .</p> <p>6. I do not support electronic road pricing which is focused on Central District.</p>	2016-03-18 10:34:03	
W00538	1127	支持		2016-03-18 09:02:05
W00537	1126	支持		2016-03-18 08:43:05
W00536	1125	我非常支持		2016-03-18 07:46:27
W00535	1124	支持		2016-03-18 07:45:22
W00534	1123	<p>我認為不應在星期日及公眾假期收費 收費應該以車輛大小收取不同的費用 收費應該以按次使用道路模式收費才能改變駕駛者的駕駛行為 支持豁免所有公共車輛的收費，因為公共車輛亦為道路減少 流量</p>		2016-03-17 23:23:41
W00533	1122	支持		2016-03-17 23:14:18
W00532	1121	支持		2016-03-17 23:11:49

W00531

W00530

W00529

W00528

W00527

W00526

W00525

W00524

W00523

W00522

	<p>你好，我們是專門仁愛堂陳寶潔紀念中學的中四學生朱詠茵及梁靜娜，就這次「電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，我們有以下的意見。</p> <p>首先，針對「收費時段」方面的問題，除緊急車輛外，我支持「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」向其他類型的車輛提供豁免/優惠。</p> <p>其一，我認為電車應豁免繳費，因為電車車體較小，事實上可說是並不阻礙交通，而且本港較少市民駕駛電車，大部分以私家車為主，電車可以在細少的道路上行駛，例如私家車可能佔兩、三輛就覆蓋整個道路，但電車車體小，它只需要佔道路的十分之二便能行駛，所以應豁免電車繳費。</p> <p>其二，我認為部分的士能享有收費的優惠，道路上主要是綠色的士，因為紅色的士大多數是前往較遠的地方，駕駛時間越長及越遠收費也相對昂貴，我們認為他們應有足夠的金錢去繳費，相反，綠色的士大多數行駛較短的路程，收費可能是紅色的一半，所以收入可能不足夠給予收費，若有優惠，能幫助減輕司機的壓力。</p> <p>另外，針對「收費時段」方面的問題，我同意「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費水平需要定期檢討。</p> <p>假如收費水平一直訂在昂貴的價錢水平上，駕駛者會認為開支不足，於是減少到中區地方，令中區少了經濟所需，例如若中區電子道路收費的水平維持在高費用上，可能會有效地舒緩交通擠塞，以及空氣污染的問題。</p> <p>相反，中區可說是購物聖地，大部分市民會自行駕駛車輛進入中區，可是收費過高，市民會因日常開支不足而減少到中區購物，因而導致中區的零售業等受到影響，引致經濟下降。</p> <p>因此，我認為需定期檢討，並在有需要時作出調整，例如可在晚上九點至第二天早上七點減低收費水平，因為這段時間大部分市民應該已放工，他們可能在家中休息，所以道路並不多車輛行駛，就算收費下降，也不會對交通擠塞有太大影響，這樣也能維持其成效。</p> <p>總括而言，我們認為政府應於整合市民意見後盡快實施電子道路收費的先導計劃，以舒緩中區的交通擠塞問題。</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:53:44</p>
	<p>支持</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:32:48</p>
	<p>我支持!</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:31:05</p>
	<p>我支持!</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:30:55</p>
	<p>我支持!</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:30:55</p>
	<p>我支持!</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:30:55</p>
	<p>同意</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:23:46</p>
	<p>支持</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:20:30</p>
	<p>很好</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:12:44</p>
	<p>ERP should be effective to reduce the congestion in main business areas in hk island. Charging is one of the most concerned issue. A well-established, reasonable and open mechanism should be considered important to adjust the actual charge to keep the effectiveness of the scheme (similar to Singapore: some traffic data have been used as indicators to reveal whether charging adjustment is necessary). The involvement of traffic data in the mechanism would be a more scientific and fair approach for price changing, which is more readily to be accepted by public.</p>	<p>2016-03-17 22:08:01</p>

W00521	1110	The electronic road price is good. It can decrease the traffic in central during peak periods, which leads to less congestion, encourages more people to take public transport and reduces emission from vehicle. It is a three-win policy: road users, pedestrians and environment will benefit from the pilot scheme.		2016-03-17 21:53:43
W00520	1109	支持		2016-03-17 21:52:49
W00519	1108	支持		2016-03-17 21:51:35
W00518	1107	I support the pilot scheme that can relieve the congestion in central and nearby business areas.		2016-03-17 21:47:22
W00517	1106	本人同意於繁忙時間向道路使用者收取費用。 因繁忙時間（如灣仔，銅鑼灣附近），有大量車輛停泊在行人路上，堵塞所有主要通道，行車緩慢，並導致空氣嚴重污染。 如果實施通過，我期望旺角一帶亦可優先電子道路收費服務！		2016-03-17 21:45:42
W00516	1105	本人同意於繁忙時間向道路使用者收取費用。 因繁忙時間（如灣仔，銅鑼灣附近），有大量車輛停泊在行人路上，堵塞所有主要通道，行車緩慢，並導致空氣嚴重污染。 如果實施通過，我期望旺角一帶亦可優先電子道路收費服務！		2016-03-17 21:45:29
W00515	1104	支持！		2016-03-17 21:43:19
W00514	1103	i am worried that the introduction of congestion charge on only central district will discourage usage of western tunnel even further, leading to more congestion in hung hom tunnel.		2016-03-17 21:37:44
W00513	1102	個人非常同意實施電子道路收費系統，星加坡已經非常成功，同意收費地區以中環為試點，及後可以考慮擴展至其他公路，效法新加坡，個人認為除緊急車輛及傷殘人士車輛外，其他均不應豁免，以達致人人平等，收費應該以收費地區交通改善情況作為準則，若情況無改善，收費應一路提高以達致預期改善效果，收費形式、方法、科技均無特別意見，只要不足及私屬程度便可		2016-03-17 18:14:54
W00512	1101	Agreed		2016-03-17 17:53:21
W00511	1100	贊成		2016-03-17 17:52:02

W00510

1099	<p>你好，本人是屯門仁愛堂陳黃淑芬紀念中學的中四學生，王梓禮及陳海霖。</p> <p>就這次「電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，我們有以下的意見。</p> <p>首先，針對「收費時段」方面的問題4，我們一致認同電子道路在交通流量高時期收費，因為平日本港交通擠塞情況極為嚴重，尤其在上班時段及下班時間最明顯，若果在車輛流量低的時候收較高的收費，會令駕駛人士會因收費金額而前往免費道路前往目的地，減少該地區的交通擠塞情況；若果在任何時段都收費，駕駛者會感到不滿，因為不論擠塞高峰時期或沒有擠塞的情況下都需付款，只會引起公眾不滿。若在收費時段成功導致雙方平衡，相信香港市民會贊成此政策。</p> <p>其次，我們亦針對「收費時段」的問題5，我們認同電子收費不於星期六及公眾假期收費，因為假日中的市民因收費以不出消費娛樂，工作壓力沒有適當的舒緩，加上本港市民有各項支出，若再增加支出只會影響該人的生活素質，有某程度上影響本港GDP。若在假期不收費，可引起市民的在該地區的消費意欲，可以緩壓力得以舒緩。</p> <p>總括而言，我們認為政府應該盡快整合各持分者意見，加快政策的成立和成效。</p>		2016-03-17 16:52:35
1098	<p>你好，我們是屯門仁愛堂陳黃淑芬紀念中學的中四學生，李念祖和董濤</p> <p>就這次(電子道路收費計劃)諮詢有以下的意見：</p> <p>首先，我們認同(中區電子道路收費先導計劃)須在收費區交通流量高的時段內收費。現時香港道路的交通擠塞不斷惡化，其中最明顯的是車輛數目持續增長，令車輛爭相使用道路的情況日趨激烈，例如過去十年港島、九龍和新界平日早上繁忙時間行車速度的變化。若任由這樣的情況繼續惡化下去，除了會使香港人的生活素質下降外，亦會影響香港的經濟發展。</p> <p>電子道路收費有許多優點，例如就你們發表的好處，能令收費區內的交通更暢通、改善收費區內的商業運作及效能、為整體經濟及社會帶來裨益，我們都對此極之同意，認為能為香港帶來更華的未來。由此，我們都認為[中區電子道路收費先導計劃]是必須的。</p> <p>然而針對問題5的問題，經過我們的一番討論後，都認為[中區電子道路收費先導計劃]須要於星期日及公眾假期收費，其因該些時段普遍較休閒，故此市民就會有更多的戶外活動，增加道路上的車流。此外於時段方面，收費計劃更應於竣工或下班時段頻密，這才能夠有效普遍到道路暢通。</p> <p>上述的為我們對道路收費的意見，希望我們的意見能為貴局提供對道路收費方面的幫助。</p>		2016-03-17 16:00:18
1097	<p>好幫好元銀哥小好安小限元幫小元·坏社去</p>		2016-03-17 15:54:59
1096	<p>i personally think that charging may not be the final solution to the question, the question is to reduce the traffic impact to the surroundings, i think traffic control is the whole point, eg, only taxi and bus are allowed to enter certain areas. Charging them will not change their behavior, a stronger action is needed</p>		2016-03-17 13:56:06

W00509

W00508

W00507



W00506

1095	<p>I support the ERP scheme.</p> <p>Q1 I think the boundary should be as simple and understandable as possible, and that through-traffic should be charged.</p> <p>Q2 I think parts of Sheung Wan and Admiralty should be included.</p> <p>Q3 I don't have a view on area- or cordon-based.</p> <p>Q4/Q5 Charge all the time.</p> <p>Q6 I don't think differential based on carrying capacity will work - many vehicles are Alphard-like vehicles with one passenger and one professional driver - so I would charge on vehicle size.</p> <p>Q7 The charge should hurt. Drivers can already afford HK\$4,000 / month for car parking fees. We're really looking at \$500+ / pass if there is to be any meaningful deterrent.</p> <p>Q8 Of course! Ambulance, police, fire should be exempted.</p> <p>Q9 IVU. This means that drivers have to pay a fee to even get started, which is a deterrent.</p> <p>Q10 None.</p> <p>Q11 I don't know enough about the subject to answer.</p> <p>Q12 Yes</p> <p>Q13 Even the cross-harbor tunnel fees. Lots of traffic is being forced to the old tunnel because it's the cheapest. Increase the fees at the old tunnel, decrease fees at the Eastern and Western Tunnels, and a lot of the traffic will not use Central. And finish the new MTR lines quicker.</p>		2016-03-17 13:46:49
------	--	--	------------------------

W00505

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
1094	I personally support the ERP Pilot scheme to be implemented as soon as possible. Traffic congestion in highly developed urban areas in HK has been becoming a critical problem which need to be addressed without further delay. I consider that this scheme will be able to alleviate it effectively.		2016-03-17 12:45:10
1093	公貼 身份証棄權 棄權  政府如何交出底線  証據 何以無人交出 何以無言		2016-03-17 12:11:07
1092	你好,我是屯門仁愛堂陳黃淑芬紀念中學的中四學生,就這次電子道路收費計劃的諮詢,本人有以下意見。  首先,針對鄰近中環的其他地區,如金鐘或上環的部分地方,是否應納入「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」內的問題,我認為該計劃的基本元素作出介紹,並展示有關元素在海外電子道路收費計劃如何運作,這些基本元素包括收費區、收費機制、收費時段、收費水平、豁免/優惠,以及採用的科技。以下我們會提出這些基本元素在「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」中可以採用的方案,以及籌劃該計劃時的其他相關事宜。 現時是著手籌劃「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的適當時機。中環及其鄰近地區是推行先導計劃的適當地點,原因扼要重述如下  中環及其鄰近地區是香港具策略重要性的商業中心區,不過,這區的交通情況並不理想,部分路段在平日早上繁忙時間的車速祇有每小時約十公里,僅較成年人的平均步速每小時四至五公里略快;  中環及其鄰近地區擁有頗佳的公共交通網絡,包括十條港鐵綫、約一百五十條專營巴士路線、約二十條公共小巴路線及六條電車路線,因此,駕駛者有多種替代交通工具前往中環及其鄰近地區;以及  當中環灣仔繞道通車後,將可提供一條免費的替代路線,供起點和終點都不在中環及其鄰近地區的駕駛者繞過收費區。  中環及其鄰近地區,劃設「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費區,由於電子道路收費計劃的主要目的是舒緩地區地的交通擠塞,收費區的範圍應限於經常出現嚴重交通擠塞的地區,在規劃實際界線時,政府會考慮不同因素,包括交通擠塞程度、公眾意見、系統要求和環境限制。  仁愛堂陳黃淑芬紀念中學中四級甲班學生 曾靈林		2016-03-17 12:02:44
1091	I disagree with ERP at this moment. When the central by pass is built the traffic flow will improve.  The focus now should be on illegal parking and conduct another mobility review 5 years after the bypass has opened.  If average speed is between 12 to 20 kmph and road pricing will achive a 25% increase in mobility, the new mobility will increase to 15 and 25 kmph. The expense may not be worth the increase in mobility.  If ERP is introduced, all profits should be used to fund road safety measures.  Please do not release my email address.  Thank you		2016-03-17 11:53:21
1090	I disagree this proposal, because the traffic problem wasn't create by private vehicle. I suggest to solve the domestic traffic problem in the central area is to limit the amount of commercial goods vehicle entering the district in limited hours. Also not permitting buses to enter Queen's Road would solve the bottle necking outside HSBC building.		2016-03-17 11:31:20

W00502

W00501

W00500

1089	<p>本人是非常同意電子道路收費，根據海外經驗，因為這是解決中國交通擁塞的治本方法。</p> <p>由於中國交通擁塞十分嚴重，連帶途經的巴士等車輛都受牽連，嚴重影響市民生活、緊急救援及商業運作。如果實行，可令收費區內的交通更暢通，改善商業運作及效能及為整體經濟及社會帶來裨益。</p> <p>收費應由20-30元不等。</p> <p>本人認為大部份車輛均需收費，包括的士在內。</p> <p>豁免和優惠應給予： 公共小巴、公共巴士、旅遊巴士等集體運輸(必須車上乘客不少於八人*)可以豁免收費 復原巴或接載有傷殘人士之車輛可以豁免收費 警車、消防車、救護車等緊急公共服務車輛均可豁免收費 至於客貨車/貨車(必須有貨件)，可考慮有優惠</p> <p>其他車輛(包括：政府車輛，車上不多於八人*)，同樣都須付全費。</p> <p>*八人的原因，是基於大部份私家車都在七人或以下，所以八人或以上才算集體運輸，以防一些駕駛人士濫用而駕駛旅遊巴士入收費區。</p> <p>如果日後運作理想，建議將電子道路收費擴展至其他重要地區。</p>			2016-03-17 11:19:01
1088	<p>All drivers in HK know quite well now that the vehicular traffic in Central CBD area is very heavy during office hours. Drivers will try their very best to avoid such very heavy traffic area but they have no alternatives as the Central - Wanchai bypass is still under construction. If such a bypass is commissioned earlier as per its initial schedule, this ERP Study and Pilot Scheme should not need a review again. It is therefore recommended to hold the study of this Pilot Scheme to see the effect of the commissioning of Central - Wanchai Bypass which in general helps solve the heavy vehicular traffic in Central CBD area.</p>			2016-03-17 10:17:05
1087	<p>你好，我們是屯門仁愛堂陳黃淑芬紀念中學的中四學生，蕭偉時、楊東聯，就這次「電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，我們有以下的意見。首先，針對「收費時段」方面的問題5，應設在上班或下班的這段時間，因為這兩個時段較繁忙，源於上班人士乘坐的交通工具，所以容易造成壅塞。</p> <p>我們認為收費的時間應設在星期一至五，大約上午8時至下午10時，這個時段內收費，且再分為繁忙時間和非繁忙時段收費，而且星期六和日可豁免，因為這兩天上班人數會較少。</p> <p>總括而言，我認為政府應採取市民意見於實施電子道路收費計劃。</p>			2016-03-17 09:52:12
1085	<p>This will not solve an inch the problem. The root of problem is illegal or lenient parking / loitering/ unloading of cars in major thoroughfares in Central. A few tow cars will solve the problem</p>			2016-03-17 09:43:26
1086	<p>This will not solve an inch the problem. The root of problem is illegal or lenient parking / loitering/ unloading of cars in major thoroughfares in Central. A few tow cars will solve the problem</p>			2016-03-17 09:43:26
1084	<p>你好，本人是屯門仁愛堂陳黃淑芬紀念中學的中四學生，你好，就今次電子道路收費計劃的諮詢，本人有以下意見。</p> <p>首先，針對豁免及優惠問題8，我建議已登記的外交車輛可獲豁免收費，因為外交車輛執行外交的活動，促進香港和別國的交流，活動對香港的文化和經濟交流會有莫大的幫助，而且外交車輛執行的是公務，屬於政府組織，而且外交車輛往往在收費方面有困難，涉及不同國家貨幣的問題，別國外交車輛有的根本不懂得如何繳費，人生路不熟你叫他如何繳費？再者，外交車輛需要收取繳費的話，會影響別國對香港的形象，此外軍用車也應得到豁免，例如中國大陸的軍用車輛涉及祖國的軍事安全，也應屬於公務，因此豁免收費是較容易理解。</p> <p>總括而言我認為實行電子道路收費系統計劃。</p>			2016-03-17 09:18:18

W00499

W00498

W00497

W00496

W00495

W00494

1083 你好，我們是仁愛堂陳黃淑芳紀念中學的中四學生，黃浩文及區健彤，就這次「電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，本人有以下的意見，首先針對「豁免及優惠」方面的問題8，我認為公共交通工具亦應享有優惠，因為公共交通工具是市民日常的基本所需，假如公共交通工具受惠，減低營運成本，令收費下調，讓市民得益，從而使普通市民物質生活素質上升，而因公共交通工具收費低，令更多市民願意乘搭，減少私家車車輛，令碳排放減少，空氣質量上升，市民生活素質上升，而且更環保，令香港綠色區區上升，進一步成為優越國際都市。

另外，我亦針對「收費水平」的問題6，應採用車輛載客量釐定收費水平，私家車的收費應該比巴士的收費高，因為私家車的載客量比巴士少，但佔用路面的地方與巴士差不多，私家車是其中一個導致交通擁塞的源頭，私家車的載客量比巴士少，一輛巴士大約可以載100人，但一輛私家車最多只是可以載6-7人，大約16輛私家車才等於一輛巴士，但佔用路面的地方比巴士多，收取較高的費用也較為合理，如果按車輛大小收取費用不公平，因為巴士的大小較其他交通工具大，但載客量和效率比其他交通工具多，收取較多的費用不合理。

總結而言，我們認為政府應該於整合市民的意見後儘快實施電子道路收費的先導計劃，以紓緩中區的交通擁塞問題。

2016-03-17 09:17:19

W00493

1082 你好，我們是仁愛堂陳黃淑芳的中四學生林漢儀及張曉彤，就這次「電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，本人有以下的意見。

首先，針對收費時段方面的問題4，我們認為該計劃須在收費區交通流量高的時段內收費，因為收費的原因都是想改善交通擁塞及空氣污染的問題，令交通更暢通，而在交通流量低時收費，會對人們不公平及並沒有那樣需要去收費。如在交通流量高峰收費，可提升車輛的運行速度外，亦能改善交通擁塞的情況。

其次，是針對收費時段方面的問題5，我們認為須在星期日及公眾假期收費，因為除了平時星期一至五的繁忙時間較多車輛，在星期日及公眾假期，通常會有較多人士放假娛樂，因此車輛的使用可能比平時多，亦會可能造成交通擁塞的情況，此時我們認為應在星期日及公眾假期收費。

總結而言，我們認為政府應該於整合市民意見後儘快實施電子道路收費的先導計劃，以紓緩中區的交通擁塞問題。

2016-03-17 09:15:59

W00492

1081 你好，我們是陳黃淑芳紀念中學的中四學生，law man ying,leung yat ho 就這次「電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，我們有以下的意見

首先，針對收費機制問題3，我們認為在中區電子道路收費先導計劃中應該選擇用同界為本收費機制，因為如果採用區域收費的話，那些駕駛人士可以無限次進入法定的區域，而駕駛人士在法定區域中只需要付一次性的款項，令到交通道路擁塞問題可能沒有改善。

如果採用同界為本的收費機制就可以避免以上情況發生，而且新加坡等管治有序的國家都是採用這個收費機制，這方法可以有效地令市民感到經濟壓力，從而選擇乘搭交通工具改善交通問題。

在配套措施方面的問題13，我們認為應該加設更多前往金鐘交通工具，從而減少私家車的數量以解決交通擁塞問題。

增加(紅)的在西區中所繳文的費用，以減少小型交通工具在中西區的滯留。

總結而言，我們認為政府應該儘快整合市民意見，儘快實施電子道路收費的先導計劃，紓緩中區的交通擁塞問題。

2016-03-17 09:15:34

W00491

1079 你好，本人是仁愛堂陳黃淑芳紀念中學的黎加華和謝曉琳同學 就這次電子道路收費計劃的諮詢，本人有以下意見

首先，針對收費計劃方面的問題4，我們一致認同應在收費區交通流量高及公眾假期等繁忙時段收費，由於大家都駕駛私家車及的士等車輛在每天的上班時間，導致中西區交通擁塞，例如中環在上下班時間經常性遇上交通問題，等待道路暢通的時候不斷排放二氧化碳，導致空氣污染，同時導致全球升溫，促使天氣不斷反常，從而令香港市民生活素質下降，根據專家測驗報告，若所有車輛使用ETC繳費，平均每輛車經常ETC道路比通過人工收費車道油耗節省量為0.0314升/車次。此外，普通轉車通過人工收費站平均時間為1.4秒，若採用ETC繳費，通過收費站的平均時間佳為3秒，即是每車次可節省約11秒的時間，另外，收費計劃可能減少車輛經過次數，但有市民曾反映「自己想去達到，有人可以阻到」，政府應繼續思考可行性，去阻礙交通擁塞。

其次，針對問題5，我們認為除緊急車輛外，應支持收費計劃向公共交通工具提出豁免，根據在「倫敦計劃」和「哥倫比亞計劃」巴士可豁免繳付電子道路收費，若公共交通工具也同時提升經過費用並使公共交通工具促使車費依然免費，相對市民的生活素質下降，市民駕駛私家車目的為了方便快捷，不願意與人共同「搶巴士」。

總結而言，我們認為政府應該於整合市民意見後，儘快實施電子收費的先導計劃，並紓緩交通擁塞問題，以改善本港市民的生活質素。

2016-03-17 09:15:33

W00490

1080 你好，我們是屯門仁愛堂陳黃淑芳紀念中學中四學生，吳嘉琪及洪家俊 就這次「電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，我們有以下意見。

首先，針對「收費機制」方面的問題3，我們認為區域為本的收費機制較適合「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」，同界為本是不適用的，因為區域為本是一般按日收費，不受時間、距離等影響，這方法可避免出現紅燈大量塞車狀況，而同界為本就沒有可能發生以上情況，導致出現便車收費站更擁塞的問題，收費費的地方沒人使用，令交通出現不分流的情況，只是集中一點，這樣的話不能電子道路也罷了。

另外，區域為本雖然缺乏靈活性，但卻能夠統一收費，只使用收費區內道路而不進人和離開繳費可以減少大部份塞車問題，少了車在區內徘徊，一些人是享受風景或坐車而一直使用道路，將收費調高會少了車流，例如英國倫敦，要140鎊元結果初期少了16%，將一些非必要駕駛者可使用繞道而行。

然後，便是針對「豁免及優惠」方面的問題8，我們支持除緊急車輛外，向其他類型車輛提供豁免優惠，因為電子道路的目的是減少車輛流量增加效能，如果不豁免或優惠給交通工具，那還是沒有什麼成效，當有收費時，一些車主可能選擇改乘搭交通工具，但是不能免的話車費可能會上調，減少市民乘搭的意欲，反而會令一些人寧願收費也不乘搭，因為毫無好處。

總結而言，我們認為政府應該於整合市民意見後儘快實施電子道路收費的先導計劃，以紓緩中區的交通擁塞問題。

2016-03-17 09:15:33

W00489

1078	<p>你好，我們是屯門仁愛堂陳黃淑芬紀念中學的中四學生麥紫諾蘇嘉琳，就這次「電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，本人有以下的意見。</p> <p>首先，針對「收費時段」方面的問題5，我認為不須在星期日及公眾假期收費，而這一計劃是希望要解決繁忙時間交通道路堵塞的最嚴重情況，這個問題源於上班族為方便而駕駛私家車，不選擇乘搭公共交通工具，所以導致堵塞問題越來越嚴重，但在星期日以及公眾假期之制，上班族會放假，輕速度定必大大提升，根據資料顯示星期日交通流量變化相比星期一至六少很多，若在流量少時仍然要收費，會大大減少人們使用道路之意欲，導致無人使用，變相導致造成交通堵塞的情況，基於原定目的為減少車流量，所以假設要在公眾假期實行政策，會造成反效果。</p> <p>總結而言，我們認為政策主要是解決交通流量較多的問題，既然星期日和公眾假期交通流量少，政策毋須在星期日和公眾假期實行收費，其次，我們認為政府應該盡快實施電子道路收費先得計劃，以解決交通堵塞問題。</p>		2016-03-17 09:15:12
------	--	--	------------------------

W00488

1077	<p>你好，本人是屯門仁愛堂陳黃淑芬紀念中學的中四學生黃啟章 章慧琳，我們就這次電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，我們有以下的意見，首先，針對收費水平的問題7，我認為能按日收費，第一，按日收費能避免司機為避免繳費而區內徘徊，但計劃的意義是避免交通堵塞，使意義失去了，因司機阻礙道路。</p> <p>第二，按日收費可以方便需多次出入該區的可憐，如一些網上落貨物的貨車司機，可多次出入而不要繳費，若需多次的繳費，會使司機公司把經濟的壓力施加於司機本人身上。</p> <p>有人認為為，按日收費，會對只經過一次的可憐不公，對於這問題，我認為這正達到電子道路收費計劃的目的，因為司機為了避免繳費而減少經過需要收費的道路，這正能達到目的，有效地減輕交通堵塞。</p> <p>其次，針對科技的問題9，我認為政府可以使用自動車牌識別的工作，若技術上出現問題，可以再通過調查再決定是否使用短距離微波科技識別科技。</p> <p>首先，短距離微波識別科技有一個弊端，就是沒有在車安裝便不能識別，在可行性上有問題，所以在執行前全港車輛都必須安裝上裝置，先可以使用該科技，但若計劃的實行需一定的時間，相反，自動車牌識別科技便沒有這問題出現，只需在道路上安裝，就可以全面推行該計劃，比起短距離微波識別科技，即時以及可行性都較容易。</p> <p>總結而言，政府應整合市民意見後盡快實施電子道路收費先得計劃，以舒緩中區的交通堵塞問題。</p>		2016-03-17 09:13:07
------	--	--	------------------------

W00487

1076	<p>你好，本人是屯門仁愛堂陳黃淑芬紀念中學的許妙鴻和黎健舜。</p> <p>就這次電子道路收費計劃的資訊本人有以下的意見。</p> <p>首先，我認為整個計劃不應局限於中環地區，例如在早上繁忙時間西隧出入口一帶會出現堵塞，為了減少該區交通流量及減少南區車輛進入中西區，上環由西隧口一帶區域應該納入收費區。</p> <p>第二，金鐘、灣仔一帶往來中區的道路甚少，尤其金鐘附近道路，巴士打道更受紅綠燈影響，所以灣仔北岸主幹道和金鐘都應該納入範圍以解決塞車問題。</p> <p>此外，對於中區電子道路收費系統我認為需要有良好的配套給予執行。</p> <p>第一，應該興建更多進入新填海區連接港外線碼頭，天馬樓，會展一帶，提升公共交通覆蓋率。</p> <p>第二，提升收費區內的停車位數量，改善了違例泊車導致交通堵塞問題。</p> <p>第三，巴士公司加強中區短線服務。</p> <p>第四，重組巴士服務與途轉車站提供提升巴士服務效率。</p> <p>第五，限制進入中區車輛的排放改善空氣質素。</p> <p>第六，招徠來往港九以及新市鎮的渡輪航線，居住在新界的市民可以有更多一個途徑前往中環。</p> <p>以上為本人提出的建議，謝謝。</p>		2016-03-17 09:11:14
------	--	--	------------------------

W00486

1075	<p>你好，我是仁愛堂陳黃淑芳紀念中學的中四學生(岑美碧，黃樂峰)就這次(電子道路收費計劃)的諮詢，本人有以下意見：</p> <p>首先，針對收費時段問題6，我認為中區電子道路收費先導計劃不須在星期日和公眾假期收費，星期日係一個家庭樂的日子，然而有很多市民都會帶著自己的小孩子到香港的每一個地方參觀，令到小孩子有多一些見識，那些家長會帶著自己的小孩子坐著自己的私家車遊山玩水，然而會經過收費區，難道這樣也要收費嗎？</p> <p>星期日或公眾假期有很多大公司都會休息，給些小員工放鬆，那些員工不用上班，代表少了市民需要乘坐私家車和交通工具上班，這樣減少了車主，所以星期日或公眾假期都不需收費。</p> <p>然後除緊急車輛，我支持「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」向其他類型的車輛提供豁免和優惠，我認為是一些公共交通工具，例如：小巴、的士、巴士等，這些車輛每天都送市民工作，若有電子道路收費，那些司機要額外附加收費，每天都來來回回地經過收費區，那不然負擔了更多的金錢？然而這些交通工具要付上更多的金錢，這樣司機便會增加對市民的收費，令到市民大眾每一天的交通費用又增加了，令到生活素質下降。</p> <p>總括而言，我認為電子道路收費計劃應該實施，這樣才能令收費區內交通更暢通。</p>	2016-03-17 09:10:07
------	---	------------------------

W00485

1074	<p>你好，本人是仁愛堂陳黃淑芳紀念中學的中四學生連海輝和黃浩軒，就這次「電子道路收費計劃」的諮詢，我們有以下的意見。首先，針對收費時段方面的問題四，我認為該計劃需在收費區交通流量最高時段內收費，我們之所以會認同此計劃基於我確實認為實施道路收費計劃可以改善中環的交通狀況，而中環的交通狀況，以中環的交通流量來看，平均於早上八時有約三萬輛或以上的車輛行駛，及直至晚上八時也不低於兩萬九千輛車輛的平均交通流量，故此星期一至五於早上八時至晚上八時都屬於交通流量最高，這通常反映車多情況會較為嚴重，從而導致不少問題再次發生，例如空氣污染等，對於業界也有可能令成本上升，收入下降，所以希望對業界進行豁免及優惠。</p> <p>另外，我們亦對於「電子道路收費計劃」的問題五有以下看法，我認同此計劃不須在星期日及公眾假期收費，我們之所以有此看法，是因為從每天平均交通流量來看，星期日的交通流量相對於星期一至六的流量低很多，即是星期日或假期甚少發生交通擠塞的情況，我認為可以分為繁忙時間收費和非繁忙時間收費，我們認為繁忙時間應設於非公眾假期的星期一至五早上六時至晚上十一時，其餘時段為非繁忙時段。</p> <p>總括而言，我們很大程度上同意實行「電子道路收費計劃」。</p>	2016-03-17 09:06:50
------	---	------------------------

W00484

1073	<p>你好，我們是陳黃淑芳紀念中學的中四學生，梁潤婷和劉晉熙，就這次電子道路收費計劃的諮詢，本人有以下意見，首先針對收費時段的題目五，我認為中區電子道路收費系統計劃應採用周界為本機制，因為這種模式應該可以有效地限制車輛進入管轄範圍內。</p> <p>本文提出擔心實施周界為本機制會出現的問題，第一，就是擔心有駕駛者在收費區內逗留，這個是收費時間下誘才離開，我建議可為車輛計算逗留時間，逗留時間越少，收費低，這應可減少車輛逗留的時間。</p> <p>其後是針對題目八的向其他車輛提出豁免或優惠，除緊急車輛外，我支持中區電子道路收費系統計劃類型的車輛提供豁免或優惠，我認為巴士、小巴、的士，運輸這些服務行業應獲得優惠，因為這些行業多數為服務人們才會走這些收費區，不應以收費去阻礙他們，尤其是的士行業，他們只是為求生計，不應打壓他們，因此我認為他們應該要獲得豁免。</p> <p>總括而言，我認為政府應該與整合市民意見後盡快實施電子道路收費的先導計劃，以舒緩中西區交通擠塞問題。</p>	2016-03-17 09:06:12
------	--	------------------------

W00483

1072	<p>One suggestion is ERP charges based on vehicle sizes (i.e. pcu), this is reasonable since a biggest vehicle sizes imply a more inelastic supply curve because increase one quantity will pull up the cost more compare to vehicle with smaller sizes, and hence the equilibrium point (as well as marginal cost) will be at a point that having a higher price (toll) and lower quantity. Therefore, a vehicle with a higher pcu should be charged more.</p> <p>On the other hand, my suggestion is also take the vehicle type into consideration. Some expensive car brand, such as Mercedes-Benz and Bavarian Motor Works, should be charged more. The reason is that these car owners are richer, and hence their demand curve is more inelastic, which means that they are willing to pay more. In order to adjusting their travel behaviour, it seems reasonable to set a higher charging level for these richer car owners.</p> <p>When it comes to the range of ERP charge, it depends on the supply and demand curve for different type of vehicle, while the optimal toll equals the difference between short run marginal and average variable costs (Herbert Mohring, 1976). If the traffic flow is low (non-peak hours), then the charging level should be lower since the demand decreased (i.e. fewer users are willing to pay if the charging level remains unchanged).</p>	2016-03-17 03:00:45
------	---	------------------------

W00482

1071	<p>車主是因為泊車車位不足，不只有中環，香港其他地方也是，汽車被迫泊街邊，應興建地下車場，鼓勵私人發展興建多些車位。</p> <p>汽車駛入中環的除私家車外有其他商用車，ERP會把費用轉嫁到普通市民身上，而去中環的私家車一般是經濟能力較好人士，他們根本不自在比較，對他們來說比錢入ERP區代表可以更加亂泊車。</p> <p>香港過去幾年沒有增加車位供應，問題已經浮面，是令市區交通擠塞的元兇，所以政府應該增加車位供應。</p>	2016-03-17 01:49:38
------	--	------------------------

W00481

1070

Views on the proposed ERP Pilot Scheme for Central and Adjacent Areas

To Transport Department

We strongly object to the proposed ERP Pilot Scheme for Central and adjacent areas. Our views are as below :

- 1) Owning a private car is no longer a luxury nowadays, but a family necessity for improving the quality of life. This should be the fundamental philosophy and principle behind government policies on road, traffic and vehicle management. Clothing(衣) - Food(食) - Housing(住) - Moving-around (行) are the four basic things of livelihood and the style and standard of which every human being has the right to pursue according to his own wish and ability. In respect of Moving-around (行), Government's role is a facilitator - to provide necessary infrastructure to facilitate people to move around freely in a safe, fair and indiscriminating manner, and to build facilities to meet changing needs of people as the standard of living and technology advance. Under this principle, all car owners should have a fair chance of using all roads. It is not fair to restrict the use of certain roads only to those who can pay more. The price of using a congested road would be the more time a driver and passengers have to spend on the road but not by paying more for getting into that section of the road.
- 2) The car journey speeds on 6 out of the 10 road sections as shown in Table 2.1 have in fact improved in 2013 as compared to 2009. The improvements on Des Voeux Road Central Eastbound and Connaught Road Central Eastbound are substantial, being 58% and 62% respectively. These figures do not justify any measure to restrict vehicles from entering into this area. Furthermore, there is no commonly accepted level of tolerance in respect of car journey speeds. Can the government explain why the journey speeds of 5.4 km/hr to 18.3 km/hr of the 10 sections of road in Table 2.1 are not acceptable and would need to take drastic actions to reduce them?
- 3) As the Central - Wan Chai Bypass will be completed very soon which will definitely improve the traffic conditions in Central substantially. Why can't the gov't wait until the Bypass is in use and an updated comprehensive car journey speeds study is conducted?!
- 4) There are a large number of private doctors/specialists with their clinics set up in Central for ages. They have a large clientele many of whom are elderly people or babies/children who rely heavily on private cars to bring them to and from specific points in Central to see doctors on a regular basis. Why should they be penalized by paying extra for the journeys to see doctors just because they travel on private cars? For these people, taxis are not alternatives as they are totally unreliable and the conditions of most of the taxis and the service of the drivers are absolutely disgusting.
- 5) The large number of buses passing through Des Voeux Road, Connaught Road and Queensway during peak hours is one of the major causes of traffic congestion in Central. Gov't should take a holistic view and take drastic and effective measures to reschedule the bus routes running through Central in order to improve the road efficiency. It is unfair to car owners if an ERP scheme is to be introduced because of Gov't's inability to solve the excessive bus route problem.
- 6) The green fixed-route mini buses are useful means for getting to/from Central. However the frequency and number of mini buses running are far from enough to meet rising demands. Take No.3 route as an example, it is almost impossible to get onto a bus along Conduit Road (or at Garden Road for going up) during peak hours unless you queue up at the terminus. If gov't could take actions to require these green bus operators to increase the frequency of schedule and to introduce more routes to meet the demand, it is for sure that much less people would need to ride on private cars to get to/out from Central.
- 7) Being car owners/drivers, we do not mind congestion on roads as it is part of life if we choose to drive. We would manage our time according to traffic condition. This is a fair play for all car owners. However, it would be highly discriminatory if a charge is to be levied for driving into certain roads, making some car owners have no choice but to pay a premium!
- 8) The Central District of HK is a unique place with a socio-economic ecology or activities profile so different from the CBD of London or Singapore. Apart from banking, finance, and offices of multi-national corporations, there are many household oriented businesses operating there for ages. In particular in the block of buildings between Pedder Street and junction of Queen's Road Central and Bonham Strand. Such businesses may include family doctors, specialist doctors, pediatrics doctors, specialty groceries, Chinese medicines, fashion accessories and services, etc. which have been serving generations of loyal clients of all ages. The catchment areas of clients of these businesses which cannot be found elsewhere, stretch all over HK Island, many of which do not have direct public transport running through Central District. For example, how can one ( particularly the elderly and people carrying young babies) go to Queen's Road Central ( West of Jubilee St) or Des Voeux Rd Central ( West of Jubilee St) from Mid-Levels ( Western, Central and Eastern) and Southern District if not by private cars, and why should the residents of these areas be penalized by the need to pay a premium for driving to Central to run daily necessity errands.
- 9) The lack of public carpark in Central is one of the causes of traffic congestions in the area as many private cars particularly those with drivers would be forced to park on road side or to drive around Central while waiting for passengers. If there are carparks as anchor points for parking the cars, these cars would stay away from the street for most of the time in Central. In contrary to the proposed demolition of the Murray Road Multi Storey carpark, which would definitely add more pressure to this problem, the gov't should conduct an overall review of the provision of carparking facilities in Central and re-provide a larger carpark if the site at Murray Road Carpark is to be re-developed.
- 10) We hereby propose that while shelving the proposed ERP scheme for Central, the government should take the following measures to improve the traffic conditions in Central :
  - a) To conduct car journey speed studies in Central after the Central Wan Chai Bypass has been in full operation for one year;
  - b) To examine the feasibility of constructing more exit roads linking up the Central Wan Chai Bypass from various points in Central, Wan Chai and Sheung Wan;
  - c) To review the provision of public carparks in Central and study the feasibility of requiring new developments in Central and the vicinity to provide drop off points, underground loading areas and public carparking facilities;
  - d) To review the bus routes running through Central with a view to reducing their number to a level that would improve road efficiency;
  - e) To introduce more routes of green mini buses running from Mid-levels ( Western, Central, and Eastern) and Southern District to Central;
  - f) To require the existing green mini bus operators serving Central to increase the schedule and the number of mini buses; and
  - g) To increase the frequency of patrol by traffic wardens or traffic police at spots where there are repeated complaints of traffic blockage by road side waiting/parking ( The initial and recurrent costs of increasing the number of traffic wardens by 10 for patrolling Central District only would be much less than those of introducing an ERP scheme).

From a group of senior citizens residing at the Mid-levels,  
Represented and signed by L H Chung ( Tel-

)

2016-03-16  
23:54:00

W00480

1069

本人十分支持電子道路收費，應盡快實行，刻不容緩。

2016-03-16  
23:15:11

W00479	1068	基本上是支持的，希望可以配套上完善，有“不離地”的諮詢安排，令市民容易明白理解政府的立場和整個流程的進度，可以真正地減少擠塞，路面得到暢通的效果。	2016-03-16 23:12:20
W00478	1067	I strongly support the government to try out the ERP pilot scheme in Central as this is an effective solution to the ever-worsening traffic congestion problem in the urban areas.	2016-03-16 22:57:30
W00477	1066	只在最繁忙的時段收費	2016-03-16 22:03:58
W00476	1065	I support the scheme as it can help alleviate the congestion.	2016-03-16 21:34:04
W00475	1064	最近在報紙得知，解決道路擠塞的方法很多，而電子道路收費也是其中之一，看過不同學者及團體的評論，本人深信電子道路收費是一個可試行之方案，支持政府推行先導計劃，但必須承諾不會影響公共交通的收費及服務，本人每天早上繁忙時段都從新界區乘坐巴士前往銅鑼灣上班，途經上環及中環區，發覺道路相當擠塞，情況非常嚴重，需要花上半小時或以上才能離開此兩區，這一帶的道路，充斥著私家車、的士及巴士，嚴重地影響行車速度，浪費時間，因此，本人建議先導計劃的收費區應納入上環及中環區，期望此計劃能真正減少道路擠塞。	2016-03-16 21:17:51
W00474	1063	支持電子道路收費計劃，請全力加強宣傳。	2016-03-16 21:17:18
W00473	1062	反對電子道路收費	2016-03-16 21:10:32
W00472	1061	同意電子道路收費 反對加車牌費。	2016-03-16 20:47:16
W00471	1060	testing	2016-03-16 17:17:47
W00470	1059	我贊成了電子道路收費,反對加牌費  Herman	2016-03-16 16:04:06
W00469	1058	贊成以中區先導計劃試行電子道路收費,本人是假日私家車車主，讚成以私家車、的士繁忙地區高收費(如150),減少交通擠塞，代替大幅增加牌費，小巴、巴士、校巴則免費。	2016-03-16 15:43:20
W00468	1057	Oppose, this method will not be effective	2016-03-16 14:47:15
W00467	1056	I have read the Webb-site view dated 12 March 2016 in response to the consultation on electronic road pricing, and I agree with their view.	2016-03-16 13:23:24
W00466	1055	support ERP pilot scheme.  suggest conducting the environmental impact assessment for the ERP pilot scheme	2016-03-16 09:44:45



W00465

1054	<p>I do agree the launch of the Electric Road Pricing plan as a price with certain deterrence could discourage people to drive to the areas that have busy traffic. A low-vehicle environment is crucial to establish Central to be a more environmentally-friendly and pedestrian-welcomed place, and certain foreign experiences have already proven that reduced road capacity would get an effect of discouraging people to drive to those areas.</p> <p>I think that private cars should be charged with the highest price since they have occupied the greatest road capacity, yet the efficiency of using private cars are very low because one private car could only carry a maximum of 7 people. The increasing number of private cars in these years have worsen the current traffic disruption along the northern part of HK Island, therefore lowering the number of private cars are inevitable for solving the existing traffic problems. On the contrary, public transport and vehicles in emergency uses should not be charged as they are playing certain role of public responsibilities, and it could encourage bus companies to provide better bus services to fulfill the enhancing demand of passengers.</p> <p>And for the pricing mechanism, I think that charging at any time the car hit the checkpoint would be a better period because it could better reflect the momentum of the vehicle, and it could prevent accumulation of vehicles in the region during the pricing hours. Yet, it is not necessary to maintain the charges during Sunday and PH because the current traffic condition in Central is okay during Sunday and PH. The free access towards Central during Sunday and PH could also help utilizing the public spaces of the commercial district during weekend, in which some of the NGOs are also promoting such concepts.</p>	2016-03-15 22:43:13
1053	讚成電子道路收費來改善交通擠塞	2016-03-15 21:09:45
1052	贊成	2016-03-15 20:21:06
1051	<p>Given the fact that the congestion problem in Central is becoming increasingly serious, the government should explore different ways to ease the problem instead of introducing the electronic road pricing system. The biggest problem with the ERP is that it will mean car-owners willing to pay or who can afford to pay will have privileged access to the roads. When society already sees a great disparity between the rich and the poor, imposing an ERP as a disincentive in this particular situation will only further exacerbate the division and increase resentment. Also, in the end the congestion problem will still remain if enough drivers are willing to pay the toll.</p> <p>The Central-Wanchai bypass construction was undertaken with an aim to ease the traffic congestion in Central. Why is it then that before the construction is completed the government already shows an eagerness to introduce the ERP? This seems to give the public the impression that the government only has monetary considerations and lacks overall planning, monitoring and management of Hong Kong's infrastructure development.</p> <p>I definitely do not think the ERP should be introduced.</p>	2016-03-15 19:11:08
1050	絕對贊成！希望能改善中環的塞車及人車爭路的情況。	2016-03-15 17:39:23
1049	贊成！可改善交通擠塞	2016-03-15 17:29:52
1048	<p>本日是一位每天駕駛人仕，如果收費能解決中環塞車問題，本人願意。</p> <p>但首先，塞車問題源頭是什麼，你可以留意每天皇后大道中，干諾道中，畢喇街邊列治車問題，這是加重塞車問題原因。</p> <p>另外，停車位問題？政府在發展，買地，有冇考慮過停車位設施？最近更加話要把的金鐘ICAC總部停車場地點改作商業用途，這樣會否加重停車位不足問題，加重塞車情況。</p> <p>以上種種，政府冇做好配套，把責任轉嫁市民，本人一定反對。</p> <p>請先了解問題所在，加強警方執法，增多停車位設施，再想收費，否則只會增加民怨。</p> <p>奉公守法市民上。謝</p>	2016-03-15 17:21:19
1047	Agree - ERP scheme	2016-03-15 17:15:25
1046	我贊成電子道路收費。	2016-03-15 17:02:47
1045	讚成電子道路收費	2016-03-15 17:02:22

W00462

W00461

W00460

W00459

W00458

W00457

W00456

W00455

W00454

W00453

W00452

W00451

W00450

W00449

W00448

W00447

W00446

W00445

W00444

W00443

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
1044	Support ERP.		2016-03-15 16:45:55
1043	強烈建議政府在中環灣仔繞道通車後立刻推行ERP改善CBD交通情況		2016-03-15 16:35:33
1042	支持推行ERP，但政府必須做好宣傳諮詢工作，引發廣泛討論，凝聚社會共識。		2016-03-15 16:13:55
1041	本人絕對支持實施電子道路收費計劃，能夠有效減少不必要車輛進入收費區，舒緩交通擠塞。不過，政府必須同時加強打擊違例泊車問題，否則會事倍功半。		2016-03-15 16:13:41
1040	贊成電子道路收費，可以改善交通擠塞和空氣污染，更可以增加行人道路綠燈時間		2016-03-15 16:09:26
1039	贊成電子道路收費來改善交通擠塞		2016-03-15 15:31:18
1038	贊成電子道路收費		2016-03-15 15:25:48
1037	請成電子道路收費來改善交通擠塞		2016-03-15 15:16:24
1036	ABC		2016-03-15 10:03:33
1035	I support the Electronic Road Pricing because it can help to reduce the journey time travelling in Central by public transport.		2016-03-15 09:44:07
1034	支持電子道路收費，要求減少車車...為我返工，又放工搭巴士日日試過港島嚴重車車，希望盡快電子道路收費！		2016-03-15 01:35:32
1033	Support the government to implement the ERP pilot scheme, rather than pursuing the vehicle quota system or the odd-even number plate vehicle usage restriction system		2016-03-14 22:45:38
1032	支持政府推行電子道路收費先導計劃，並以此計劃用作補充警方對違例交通執法的有所不足之處		2016-03-14 22:40:33

W00442

1031	<p>1) The ERP program can only be effective if it cover a significant area, as the charging mechanism will likely push traffic to the streets surrounding the charge area. As such, the pilot scheme as is stands appears insufficient to make any meaningful statistics.</p> <p>2) The charging level should be variable, based on the amount of congestion and size of vehicles. California's Fasstrak provide a good example of charging based on congestion levels.</p> <p>3) The congestion charge should not offer exemptions, except emergency vehicles. This is because any vehicles that pass through the zone would occupy road space. Please note toll-free stickers for low-emission vehicles have been phased out on the Fasstrak program.</p> <p>4) The technology should be tied to the vehicles as a decal (i.e. Taiwan eTag). To address commercial use, taximeters should be integrated to record charges automatically, whenever a ERP charge is required, so drivers do not have to carry the burden of a delay in receiving payments. Payments for the congestion charge will be made directly on the new taximeter. The new taximeter should have an interface to accept customer payment by octopus; accept driver's payment of ERP by octopus; credit customer payments made to driver's octopus account on a same-day basis.</p> <p>Thank you for listening to the public's voices.</p> <p>Mr. Lam</p>		2016-03-14 18:00:29
1030	<p>The ERP scheme should charge EVERY time someone enters or leaves the area, in a 24 hour period and not just once. You come in and out 3 times, you congest the roads 3 times, so you logically pay 3 times. Taxis should NOT be exempt. They should pay every time they enter the zone, and be allowed to add the fee to the customer's bill. Charges should vary at different times of day based on demand. Charges should be adjusted continually (say every 2-3 months) to achieve a target average traffic speed, balancing the supply of road space with the demand. If the actual traffic speed is too low, then the charge should be raised. No exemptions for electronic vehicles. This is not a pollution charge, but a congestion charge. They congest the roads too. Allow enforcement of the zone, and parking infringements via cameras. The police are scared of giving out tickets, and just ineffectually ask people to move. Enforce the law with fines and people will stop parking illegally.</p> <p>Gregory Austin HKID: Tel:</p>		2016-03-14 15:52:08

W00441

W00440

1029	<p>My view is very simple.</p> <p>The ERP is a simple way to raise taxes and promote inaction from police. It will be a total waste of time, energy and money for the following reasons:</p> <p>I presume the idea of introducing ERP was to improve traffic in Central.</p> <p>Then you should ask why do we have a blocked traffic in Central!</p> <p>The answer is simple. The traffic flow is blocked by trucks and cars illegally parked. If you remove the problem you re-establish the flow.</p> <p>How to remove the problem?</p> <p>Ask the Police to enforce the law!!!</p> <p>Why do they allow vehicles to park/wait on double yellow lines all day long, even in areas where it says that vehicle parked will be prosecuted without notice! The Police should WORK and write penalty tickets immediately instead of asking cars to move around and... come back thus increasing the traffic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.- Prosecute drivers parking in double line (Princess Bldg, Queen's Rd...) take 1 point!</li><li>2.- Place more parking meters in one way law traffic roads or secondary streets.</li><li>3.- Prosecute drivers stopping on yellow crossing.</li><li>4.- Prohibit delivery trucks to deliver anything in Central between 7:30am and 7:00pm</li><li>5.- Install Parking cameras similar to speeding cameras, already in use in France and other countries.</li><li>6.- Transfer to Central "brownies" monitoring parking meters to help police enforcing the law by giving tickets to offenders. They spend lots of time walking small streets and checking parking meters which cars do not block the circulation....</li><li>7.- Ensure that busses stop properly at bus stop without blocking all lines.</li><li>8.- Improve the synchronization of green lights to help traffic flow.</li></ol> <p>As a result of this measures you will achieve the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.- Increase the revenue from prosecutions, Lots of \$\$</li><li>2.- Save lots of \$\$ from not spending on ERP hardware, staff, maintenance....</li><li>3.- Improve traffic in Central and in HK. the measures above could be extended to all areas where and when required.</li><li>4.- Once drivers have been prosecuted a few times they will learn and the police will be able to reduce their presence by making less rounds.</li></ol> <p>I have given a lot of thought to the ERP proposal and I hope my above suggestions will be presented to the board members before they have to take the vote.</p> <p>Incidentally I have send recommendations several times to Inf.ERP and @1823 also asking to let me know the specific reasons why the police department was not prosecuting offenders as they should be very well aware of the situation (Princess Bldg, Queen's Rd, Windham street.) The only response I received was Thank you for your valuable comments which will be forwarded to the relevant department....</p> <p>Hope someone responsible will take notice of the above.</p> <p>Incidentally one has to realise that introducing ERP to a certain area will just push the problem to the neighbouring areas and so on.</p>	2016-03-14 15:51:14
------	---	---------------------

電子道路收費先導計劃意見調查研究報告  
Report on Electronic Road Pricing Pilot Scheme Opinion Poll

The Lion Rock Institute  
獅子山學會

Contact: Laurence Pak (Director of Operations)  
Phone  
Email:

The government has launched a public consultation on the introduction of Electronic Road Pricing ("ERP") in Hong Kong, with a proposed ERP pilot scheme in Central and its adjacent areas (the exact boundary is not yet decided). The aim of ERP is to reduce localised traffic congestion. Similar schemes have been implemented in London and Singapore, which needless to say have very different urban density and road patterns from Hong Kong.

We successfully interviewed 1,080 respondents on the streets and on the public transportation terminals near the Central area (please see Annex 1 for a copy of the survey). The survey found that 293 (27.1%) respondents are professional drivers (8.33% (of all respondents) are taxi drivers, 7.41% are minibus drivers, 5.74% are commercial vehicle drivers, 3.15% are private car drivers (as professional driver) and 2.5% are bus drivers).

For the 787 (72.9%) respondents who are non-professional drivers, their usual commute to work/school are as follows: 35.37% use the MTR/train, 13.15% use a private car, 7.89% use a bus, 5.19% use a taxi, 3.80% use a minibus, 2.96 use a tram, with the remaining 4.72 either walk or use other transportation methods. Overall survey responses are shown on Annex 2.

Almost 90% of all respondents agree that during the peak hours, the congestion problem in central area is either very serious or serious, and 49% of all respondents are personally affected by these congestion problems. When asked what is the major cause of these traffic congestions (respondents can pick more than one type), 76% of all respondents agree that commercial vehicles are a main cause of congestion, while 68% think that private cars and 47% think that buses are also a main cause.

The overall response to the ERP Pilot Scheme, and the possibility that this scheme will expand to cover other regions in the future is as follows: of all the respondents, close to 30% showed support or full support to the scheme, while 70% opposed or fully opposed. Some types of professional drivers are particularly supportive: 100% of all bus drivers show support for the ERP scheme, however, 60% of taxi drivers and 77.5% of minibus drivers opposed to the ERP scheme. Of the non-professional drivers, 62% of tram passengers showed support, while 65% of private car (non-professional) drivers opposed the ERP scheme. It is interesting to note that more than 70% MTR passengers and people who walk or take other transportations also opposed the idea.

The survey shows that when asked how much money the respondents are willing to spend every day to reduce traffic congestion: more than one-third (40%) of all respondents are not willing to spend anything (\$0), 27% of respondents are willing to spend something less than \$2 per day. People who are willing to spend a high amount (\$5 or higher per day) are mostly taxi drivers or people who drive a private car to commute to work. 90% of taxi drivers are willing to pay something in between \$10.10 to \$20 per day to reduce congestion, while for non-professional private car drivers, 35% are willing to spend \$2.1 - \$5, 27.46% are willing to spend \$5.1 - \$10, 12.68% are willing to spend \$10.10 - \$20 and 6.34% are willing to spend more than \$20.10.

In terms of solutions that can be used to alleviate congestion problems, we asked the respondents whether solutions like increasing cross harbour tunnel tolls, restructuring of bus routes, or increasing enforcement of existing traffic regulations will effectively reduce congestion in Central area. 75.3% of all respondents either agree or fully agree that these solutions will help. Professional drivers are particularly more enthusiastic: 100% of all bus drivers, and 90% of all taxi drivers either agree or fully agree to these solutions.

We also asked if the respondents agree the Central-Wanchai Bypass (currently in construction) when completed will effectively reduce congestion. 92% of all respondents either agreed or fully agreed. Again the professional drivers showed a high degree of agreement: 100% of bus and minibus drivers, 90% of taxi drivers and 85.48% commercial vehicle drivers either agreed or fully agreed to this.

If we have the above measures in place (Central-Wanchai Bypass and measures such as increasing tunnel tolls, restructuring of bus routes and increasing enforcement) we asked the respondents if they still see a need for the ERP Scheme. 37% of the overall respondents agreed or fully agreed that we should still have a ERP Scheme, while 62.41% disagree or fully disagreed. All Bus drivers support the ERP, while most Taxi (70%) and Minibuses (78.75%) opposes to the ERP. For Commercial vehicle drivers, the difference is not as clear cut. 43.55% supports the ERP, while 56% opposes it. Most non-professional drivers show opposition to the ERP, with 82.9% of passengers who commute regularly using minibus, and 69% who use taxis. 65% of Tram passengers favours having the ERP, and for non-professional private car drivers, 46% show support, while 54% opposes it.

We asked the respondents if there is an ERP, should any type of transportation be exempted. There is an obvious trend that both professional drivers and passengers want their own type of transportation to be exempted, but overall, 60.28% of all respondents want buses to be exempt, and 49.6% and 47% want trams and minibus to be exempted, respectively.

We asked the respondents if the type of transportation they use are not exempted, in general 68% of all respondents opposed to the possibility of having the increased costs transferred to the passengers. Bus drivers are the only group who showed clear support to the cost transfer.

We also asked the respondents if the Electronic Road Pricing Scheme will increase the operating costs of businesses in the affected area, for example in higher goods delivery costs, 77% of all respondents oppose to the possibility of having the increased costs transferred to the customers. No sub-group of respondents show any clear support.

When asked about any privacy concerns to the ERP, 68% of all respondents are not concerned, consistently across almost all sub-groups of respondents. 60% of taxi drivers however do have concern over privacy.

Based on the survey, The Lion Rock Institute does not see any support from HK residents to establish an ERP. 70% of all respondents oppose to the ERP Pilot Scheme. While the public perceives a serious traffic congestion problem in the Central area, important questions are unanswered, such as the fact that 75% of all respondents agree that solutions such as increasing cross harbour tunnel tolls, the restructuring of bus routes (47% of all respondents believe that buses are one of the major cause of congestion), and increasing enforcement of traffic regulations will help reduce congestion. Also, even a greater percentage of respondents think that the Central-Wanchai Bypass when completed should help reduce congestion. 60% of all respondents do not think we should have an ERP given that we have simpler solutions, therefore The Lion Rock Institute is against introducing the ERP Pilot Scheme before the completion of the Central-Wanchai Bypass, and before these simpler solutions are utilized.

There is also an important question of costs. The government makes no mention of how much the Pilot Scheme will cost, therefore it becomes impossible to judge whether it will be effective. Most people also oppose having increased costs directly or indirectly transferred to the residents through increased transport costs (68%) and increased costs of business in the area inside the ERP (77.6%).

W00439

1028

2016-03-14 15:08:18

W00438

1027	<p>My answers to all the reference questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The root cause of the congestion in Central district is lack of road and parking facilities. Electronic payment will not solve the problem. It is only diverting the problem to other road as drivers are not willing to pay the fare.</li><li>2. None of the district should be included.</li><li>3. None of the system is suitable for Hong Kong.</li><li>4. Yes. I still vote against the idea of pricing the road usage as the solution is not fixing the root cause</li><li>5. Yes, public holidays should be exempted. I still vote against the idea of pricing the road usage as the solution is not fixing the root cause.</li><li>6. I still vote against the idea of pricing the road usage as the solution is not fixing the root cause.</li><li>7. Pay per use. I still vote against the idea of pricing the road usage as the solution is not fixing the root cause</li><li>8. No exemption. Otherwise, taxi, minibus, and other commercial vehicles will block the road anyways. That's why I do not think the pricing scheme will help solving the congestion problem.</li><li>9. NFC for better privacy.</li><li>10. The traffic record should be deleted after 1 month.</li><li>11. Congestion occurrence per day.</li><li>12. Yes, but unless it is as pricy as Western harbour tunnel, otherwise, I don't see any affect. Increasing the price to this level will bring out another problem, and hence, I vote against the pricing scheme.</li><li>13. This will not be a solution to the congestion problem. I suggest scrapping this idea and focus on expanding roads and build more carpark via city planning.</li></ol>		2016-03-14 15:01:28
------	--	--	---------------------

My views are:

In response to the specific questions in Appendix 4:

#### Charging area

For any chosen area of HK, some traffic normally passes through that area to destinations outside it (through-traffic) while other traffic has a destination within that area (destination traffic). If the charging area is too small, then some of the destination traffic will shift its destination to just outside the boundary, rather than not coming at all. For example, if you draw a small area with a car park just outside it, then that will boost revenue for the car park and reduce the deterrent to vehicle journeys. Congestion near the car park may even increase. Take care to ensure that the roads near the boundary can handle the increase.

Through-traffic will tend to avoid the charging area, increasing traffic on roads near the boundary, so please ensure that these roads have sufficient capacity, or if they don't, then they too must have charging, perhaps at lower rates, the further away you get from the core charging zone, so we may need a core zone and an adjacent secondary charging zone.

#### Open data

There is only a need for charging at times and in areas where vehicle speeds are below a target threshold. The Government collects, or should collect, detailed data on existing road traffic, but we are not aware of how detailed this is - whether, for example, it counts vehicles passing specific points in narrow time intervals. We call on the Government to publish all the data in an open, free, machine-readable form, with real-time updates, so that the community can analyse it, suggest where more data are needed, and help to design a solution. With insufficient data, we cannot make further comment on the charging area.

#### Charging mechanism

The objective of ERP is to reduce congestion, so this logically requires the cordon-based mechanism, charging vehicles whenever they cross a boundary. You misleadingly call a scheme in which vehicles are only charged once per day, regardless of the number of journeys, an "area-based" mechanism, but it is in fact a daily-rate mechanism for crossing a cordon. In the daily-rate mechanism, vehicles are only charged for the first visit and not subsequent visits to the congestion zone. A daily-rate would have only a minimal impact on congestion, particularly because a large portion of the traffic comprises vehicles which visit multiple times per day, including buses and taxis. In a daily-rate mechanism it is also harder to vary the charge based on demand at different times of day.

A charge should be made on both entry and exit during congestion times, otherwise the congestion will be higher in the evening rush hour. Some car owners may drive to work early in the morning, when the charge is low or zero, park their car in a car park and then leave in the evening rush hour, so they must be charged for the evening congestion. Coming to work early shouldn't exempt you from congesting the roads in the evenings.

#### Traffic in Queen's Road Central

#### Taxis

Taxi drivers or owners may complain about the ERP proposals and embark on their usual protests. The solution is to incentivise them to support ERP. Taxis should be allowed to charge the passenger double the congestion charge for a journey which enters or exits the zone, so that if they enter or leave empty, then their cost will be covered, while if they have passengers in both directions, then they will make a profit on the charge. Only if they are empty in both directions will they make a loss. Remember that private cars are more efficient users of road space than taxis, because they only occupy roads when they are actually on a journey.

#### Charging period

Charges should be calibrated to achieve a target average traffic speed, balancing the supply of road space with the demand for it. If the actual traffic speed is too low, then the charge should be raised. Conversely, if the speed exceeds the target, then lower the charge. Consequently, charges should vary at different times of day based on demand. At certain times of day (particularly overnight) the charge will consequently be zero. The tariff should be reviewed on a regular basis (say, every 3 months) so as to maintain the target traffic speed in response to shifting demand.

There is nothing special about Sundays or public holidays except that demand may be lower then, justifying a zero charge, but if the weekday charging results in a shift in demand to Sundays then congestion charges may be needed. It is important not to raise expectations that Sunday should be a free-for-all day on which congestion does not matter. In some shopping areas, such as Causeway Bay, you may find that congestion is very heavy on Sundays. Stick to the principles and charge only to achieve a target traffic speed, regardless of the day of the week.

#### Charging level, exemptions and concessions

Resist the political temptation to combine social engineering, vote-buying (in the transport sector) or social welfare with traffic management. If you exempt sectors or charge based on irrelevant factors then those who pay will feel that they are being charged to offset the congestion caused by those who don't, and the scheme will fail to gain public acceptance.

The approach should be strictly based on the road space occupied by a vehicle and agnostic to the number of passengers it carries or could carry. So a car, taxi and light goods minivan should all pay the same amount (call it X), a motorcycle should pay 0.5X, a minibus or a light goods vehicle 1.5X, while a heavy goods vehicle or large bus should pay 2X.

This will still result in a per-passenger cost which is lower for buses than cars, incentivising the use of buses, which are more efficient users of road space except when they are empty or nearly empty. 40 passengers on a bus that pays 2X will pay (via the bus fare) 0.05X each, while a person in a private car with no passengers will pay 20 times that. It is up to bus companies to structure their routes and frequencies to achieve higher occupancy so that the congestion charge is spread more thinly across fares. They may also add a small surcharge for congestion periods, incentivising passengers to use off-peak times.

A per-vehicle charge also incentivises ride-sharing in cars and taxis. However, please see our article Busting HK's road transport cartels (14-Dec-2015). One of the causes of congestion at peak times is that the Government refuses to issue more licenses for public light buses (PLBs) and non-franchised buses, so those who need to travel by road use private cars instead.

Electric vehicles don't produce road-side emissions, but they still occupy road space, slowing down the vehicles behind them, so they should pay the same as other vehicles.

The only sensible exception is emergency-services vehicles. Other Government vehicles, including the black, chauffeur-driven limousines that ferry our senior officials and civil servants around, should pay the charge, even though the revenue goes back to another Government department. It would at least impact the departmental budget and make them think about using public transport as most people do.

#### Technology

W00437

1028

2016-03-14  
14:31:41

What you call Dedicated Short-range Radio Communication (DSRC), or put simply, tagging, is the way to go. We also suggest that the tags be easily removed and replaced, so that people who share the usage of a vehicle (such as taxi-drivers who rent a vehicle for a shift) can use their own tag. However, with a tariff based on vehicle size, there must of course be random checking using road-side cameras to ensure that people don't buy a motor-cycle tag and use it on a heavy goods vehicle.  
Parking, stopping, and lay-bys

The same DSRC technology should be deployed in all parking meters in HK, so that vehicles are automatically charged when they park and until they leave. All lay-bys should also have meters. There should be a free period of 5 minutes for pick-ups and drop-offs. If your vehicle is still there after 5 minutes then you will be charged, and if it is a lay-by, then at a premium rate (say, double the normal parking rate), because a lay-by is supposed to be a drop-off and pick-up area, not a parking zone, and you need higher availability.

This will stop the frequent practice of drivers hogging lay-bys and parking spaces without paying, triggering other users to stop in the road lanes. Charges on parking meters should be raised to meet demand - currently they do not exceed \$2 per 15 minutes, which is, in many places, about one third of the cost of car parks. This often results in criminals controlling the spaces and creaming off the difference in "valet parking" rackets.

Road lanes should also be strict no-stopping areas during congestion charging times, because a prime factor in congestion is when drivers stop in a curb-side vehicle lane waiting for their bosses or unloading goods, blocking an entire lane and causing dozens of vehicles to have to manoeuvre around them. Penalties must be raised and enforcement increased.  
Privacy concern

There can be no real issue surrounding privacy. That was really just an excuse that the Government used the last time it proposed ERP, to avoid tackling vested interests in the transport sector. The reason not to be concerned is that the level of surveillance already open to the Government with its network of CCTV cameras and access to cellphone location data (from triangulation of base stations) means that tracking vehicle number plates does not materially increase the intrusion. If you are on a secret mission then you can always wear a disguise and take public transport using an Octopus card bought with cash.  
Effectiveness

Obviously the effectiveness should be determined by whether the tariff has achieved the target traffic speed, no more and no less. Yes, the tariff should be reviewed, we suggest quarterly. Numerous factors affect road demand, including weather (demand may be higher in the hot-and-rainy season when walking is less attractive), fuel costs, incomes and alternative transport costs.  
Complementary measures

Yes:

See our proposals for parking metering and lay-by charges above.

See our proposals in the article Busting HK's Road Transport Cartels (14-Dec-2015)

Abolish First Registration Tax (FRT). Owning a vehicle does not increase road congestion or air pollution. Using it does. See our article Traffic Truths, 1, 13-Apr-2011.

Abolish annual vehicle license fees for the same reason.

To reduce air pollution, reintroduce diesel duty and charge LPG duty too. For vote-buying and socialist reasons, duty on diesel and LPG has been set at zero while petrol duty remains at \$6.06 per litre (unchanged in years).

So goods vehicles, taxis, buses and minibuses are not paying for the air pollution and the consequent health care costs and economic losses caused by illness. You probably need to raise the duty level on petrol too.

The revenue from road pricing and taxing LPG, diesel and petrol can offset the revenue lost by abolition of FRT and vehicle license fees.

After limiting road usage with congestion pricing and deterring illegal parking/stopping in vehicle lanes with stiffer fines and enforcement, consider introducing dedicated cycle lanes and/or widening pavements for pedestrians by dropping one of the vehicle lanes. Encourage cycling with bike rental and parking facilities as many major cities have done.

Very supportive of ERP Pilot Scheme in Central and its adjacent areas.

Q 7 Do you have any suggestion on the range of ERP charge which you believe could induce motorists to adjust their travel behaviour when (a) ERP charge is levied on a per day basis; or (b) ERP charge is levied on a per pass basis (charging at each and every charging point)?

Per day - > HK\$30  
Per pass - > HK\$15

W00436

1025

2016-03-14  
11:46:11



W00435

1024	<p>Charging Area: This should include all busy business and shopping areas. There should be exceptions for controlled access roads running through such areas to provide a means for through traffic to avoid the charge or pay a different rate if they do not enter the regular roads.</p> <p>Charging Mechanism: This should be by electronic tagging and be integrated with tunnel access, parking stations (private and public), parking meters, and lay-byes.</p> <p>Charging period: to be effective in reducing congestion and pollution, which should be the two only criteria for a charge, the charge should be variable by time of day, day of the week, and duration spent inside the zone. Vehicles parked in off-road spaces should not be charged for the time spent not on the public road. This would require private parking spaces or buildings to be fitted with a system of sensors.</p> <p>Charging Level: The charges should vary with the level of congestion and realtime roadside pollution in each zone. Charges should REPLACE existing vehicle taxes as far as possible to transfer the cost from ownership to USE. The duties on petrol and diesel should be at least unified as should LPG unless private vehicles are allowed to use it.</p> <p>Exemption and concession: These should be strictly limited to police, ambulance, and fire vehicles and perhaps vehicles used solely by those of very limited mobility. Public buses, taxis and trams should NOT be exempt but the rates charged should be per vehicle (perhaps divided into small, medium, and large) which would automatically give a benefit to buses on a per-person basis. ALL vehicles should be charged on the same basis whatever their fuel type but concessionary rates could be considered for truly non-emission vehicles such as pure electric and hydrogen powered ones. However, as even "clean" vehicles occupy road-space and cause congestion they should not be exempt.</p> <p>Technology: Removable electronic tags should be employed so that if a vehicle is shared it is easy for the driver to change the tag. Payment should be on a pre-pay "octopus" type system. Cameras should be used to confirm that vehicles are using the correct tags.</p> <p>Privacy: I have no privacy concerns which cannot be addressed by suitable encryption of data and legal protection of identity and location from general scrutiny.</p> <p>Effectiveness: The effectiveness of such schemes can easily be seen in cities such as Singapore and London whose technology is much less advanced than what is possible for Hong Kong.</p> <p>Complimentary Measures: Apart from the adjustment to vehicle taxes and fuel duties already mentioned the tunnel system should be brought into the same integrated charging system with the same adjustable rates depending on time of day, congestion, and pollution levels.</p> <p>Edwin McAuley</p>		2016-03-14 11:33:25
------	--	--	------------------------

W00434

1023

In response to the specific questions in Appendix 4:

#### Charging area

For any chosen area of HK, some traffic normally passes through that area to destinations outside it (through-traffic) while other traffic has a destination within that area (destination traffic). If the charging area is too small, then some of the destination traffic will shift its destination to just outside the boundary, rather than not coming at all. For example, if you draw a small area with a car park just outside it, then that will boost revenue for the car park and reduce the deterrent to vehicle journeys. Congestion near the car park may even increase. Take care to ensure that the roads near the boundary can handle the increase.

Through-traffic will tend to avoid the charging area, increasing traffic on roads near the boundary, so please ensure that these roads have sufficient capacity, or if they don't, then they too must have charging, perhaps at lower rates, the further away you get from the core charging zone, so we may need a core zone and an adjacent secondary charging zone.

#### Open data

There is only a need for charging at times and in areas where vehicle speeds are below a target threshold. The Government collects, or should collect, detailed data on existing road traffic, but we are not aware of how detailed this is - whether, for example, it counts vehicles passing specific points in narrow time intervals. We call on the Government to publish all the data in an open, free, machine-readable form, with real-time updates, so that the community can analyse it, suggest where more data are needed, and help to design a solution. With insufficient data, we cannot make further comment on the charging area.

#### Charging mechanism

The objective of ERP is to reduce congestion, so this logically requires the cordon-based mechanism, charging vehicles whenever they cross a boundary. You misleadingly call a scheme in which vehicles are only charged once per day, regardless of the number of journeys, an "area-based" mechanism, but it is in fact a daily-rate mechanism for crossing a cordon. In the daily-rate mechanism, vehicles are only charged for the first visit and not subsequent visits to the congestion zone. A daily-rate would have only a minimal impact on congestion, particularly because a large portion of the traffic comprises vehicles which visit multiple times per day, including buses and taxis. In a daily-rate mechanism it is also harder to vary the charge based on demand at different times of day.

A charge should be made on both entry and exit during congestion times, otherwise the congestion will be higher in the evening rush hour. Some car owners may drive to work early in the morning, when the charge is low or zero, park their car in a car park and then leave in the evening rush hour, so they must be charged for the evening congestion. Coming to work early shouldn't exempt you from congesting the roads in the evenings.

#### Traffic in Queen's Road Central

##### Taxis

Taxi drivers or owners may complain about the ERP proposals and embark on their usual protests. The solution is to incentivise them to support ERP. Taxis should be allowed to charge the passenger double the congestion charge for a journey which enters or exits the zone, so that if they enter or leave empty, then their cost will be covered, while if they have passengers in both directions, then they will make a profit on the charge. Only if they are empty in both directions will they make a loss. Remember that private cars are more efficient users of road space than taxis, because they only occupy roads when they are actually on a journey.

#### Charging period

Charges should be calibrated to achieve a target average traffic speed, balancing the supply of road space with the demand for it. If the actual traffic speed is too low, then the charge should be raised. Conversely, if the speed exceeds the target, then lower the charge. Consequently, charges should vary at different times of day based on demand. At certain times of day (particularly overnight) the charge will consequently be zero. The tariff should be reviewed on a regular basis (say, every 3 months) so as to maintain the target traffic speed in response to shifting demand.

There is nothing special about Sundays or public holidays except that demand may be lower then, justifying a zero charge, but if the weekday charging results in a shift in demand to Sundays then congestion charges may be needed. It is important not to raise expectations that Sunday should be a free-for-all day on which congestion does not matter. In some shopping areas, such as Causeway Bay, you may find that congestion is very heavy on Sundays. Stick to the principles and charge only to achieve a target traffic speed, regardless of the day of the week.

#### Charging level, exemptions and concessions

Resist the political temptation to combine social engineering, vote-buying (in the transport sector) or social welfare with traffic management. If you exempt sectors or charge based on irrelevant factors then those who pay will feel that they are being charged to offset the congestion caused by those who don't, and the scheme will fail to gain public acceptance.

The approach should be strictly based on the road space occupied by a vehicle and agnostic to the number of passengers it carries or could carry. So a car, taxi and light goods minivan should all pay the same amount (call it X), a motorcycle should pay 0.5X, a minibus or a light goods vehicle 1.5X, while a heavy goods vehicle or large bus should pay 2X.

This will still result in a per-passenger cost which is lower for buses than cars, incentivising the use of buses, which are more efficient users of road space except when they are empty or nearly empty. 40 passengers on a bus that pays 2X will pay (via the bus fare) 0.05X each, while a person in a private car with no passengers will pay 20 times that. It is up to bus companies to structure their routes and frequencies to achieve higher occupancy so that the congestion charge is spread more thinly across fares. They may also add a small surcharge for congestion periods, incentivising passengers to use off-peak times.

A per-vehicle charge also incentivises ride-sharing in cars and taxis. However, please see our article Busting HK's road transport cartels (14-Dec-2015). One of the causes of congestion at peak times is that the Government refuses to issue more licenses for public light buses (PLBs) and non-franchised buses, so those who need to travel by road use private cars instead.

Electric vehicles don't produce road-side emissions, but they still occupy road space, slowing down the vehicles behind them, so they should pay the same as other vehicles.

The only sensible exception is emergency-services vehicles. Other Government vehicles, including the black, chauffeur-driven limousines that ferry our senior officials and civil servants around, should pay the charge, even though the revenue goes back to another Government department. It would at least impact the departmental budget and make them think about using public transport as most people do.

#### Technology

What you call Dedicated Short-range Radio Communication (DSRC), or put simply, tagging, is the way to go. We also suggest that the tags be easily removed and replaced, so that people who share the usage of a vehicle (such as taxi-drivers who rent a vehicle for a shift) can use their own tag. However, with a tariff based on vehicle size, there must of course be random checking using road-side cameras to ensure that people don't buy a motor-cycle tag and use it on a heavy goods vehicle.

#### Parking, stopping, and lay-bys

The same DSRC technology should be deployed in all parking meters in HK, so that vehicles are automatically charged when they park and until they leave. All lay-bys should also have meters. There should be a free period of 5 minutes for pick-ups and drop-offs. If your vehicle is still there after 5 minutes then you will be charged, and if it is a lay-by, then at a premium rate (say, double the normal parking rate), because a lay-by is supposed to be a drop-off and pick-up area, not a parking zone, and you need higher availability.

This will stop the frequent practice of drivers hogging lay-bys and parking spaces without paying, triggering other users to stop in the road lanes. Charges on parking meters should be raised to meet demand - currently they do not exceed \$2 per 15 minutes, which is, in many places, about one third of the cost of car parks. This often results in criminals controlling the spaces and creaming off the difference in "valet parking" rackets.

Road lanes should also be strict no-stopping areas during congestion charging times, because a prime factor in congestion is when drivers stop in a curb-side vehicle lane waiting for their bosses or unloading goods, blocking an entire lane and causing dozens of vehicles to have to manoeuvre around them. Penalties must be raised and enforcement increased.

#### Privacy concern

There can be no real issue surrounding privacy. That was really just an excuse that the Government used the last time it proposed ERP, to avoid tackling vested interests in the transport sector. The reason not to be concerned is that the level of surveillance already open to the Government with its network of CCTV cameras and access to cellphone location data (from triangulation of base stations) means that tracking vehicle number plates does not materially increase the intrusion. If you are on a secret mission then you can always wear a disguise and take public transport using an Octopus card bought with cash.

2018-03-14  
11:22:59

Effectiveness

Obviously the effectiveness should be determined by whether the tariff has achieved the target traffic speed, no more and no less. Yes, the tariff should be reviewed, we suggest quarterly. Numerous factors affect road demand, including weather (demand may be higher in the hot-and-rainy season when walking is less attractive), fuel costs, incomes and alternative transport costs.

Complementary measures

Yes:

See our proposals for parking metering and lay-by charges above.

See our proposals in the article Busting HK's Road Transport Cartels (14-Dec-2015)

Abolish First Registration Tax (FRT). Owning a vehicle does not increase road congestion or air pollution. Using it does. See our article Traffic Truths, 1, 13-Apr-2011.

Abolish annual vehicle license fees for the same reason.

To reduce air pollution, reintroduce diesel duty and charge LPG duty too. For vote-buying and socialist reasons, duty on diesel and LPG has been set at zero while petrol duty remains at \$6.06 per litre (unchanged in years).

So goods vehicles, taxis, buses and minibuses are not paying for the air pollution and the consequent health care costs and economic losses caused by illness. You probably need to raise the duty level on petrol too.

The revenue from road pricing and taxing LPG, diesel and petrol can offset the revenue lost by abolition of FRT and vehicle license fees.

After limiting road usage with congestion pricing and deterring illegal parking/stopping in vehicle lanes with stiffer fines and enforcement, consider introducing dedicated cycle lanes and/or widening pavements for pedestrians by dropping one of the vehicle lanes. Encourage cycling with bike rental and parking facilities as many major cities have done.

At last, the HK Government appears willing to do something that will upset vested interests for the greater public good. We support this. Road pricing is not in fact a new concept in HK - there are already charges for various tunnels, bridges and the Route 3 Country Park Section. Lessons can be learned from the implementation of those. It is remarkable that the tolls on all of those are the same at every hour of the day. This is not optimal.

Even the MTR has an early-bird discount (or if you prefer, a premium outside that period) in urban areas to shift demand, although they don't follow through with differential pricing around the evening rush hour. Remember, you stripped the MTRC of its fare autonomy some years ago, and if you won't let them increase fares at peak times then they can't discount at off-peak times without losing revenue.

In response to the specific questions in Appendix 4:

Charging area

For any chosen area of HK, some traffic normally passes through that area to destinations outside it (through-traffic) while other traffic has a destination within that area (destination traffic). If the charging area is too small, then some of the destination traffic will shift its destination to just outside the boundary, rather than not coming at all. For example, if you draw a small area with a car park just outside it, then that will boost revenue for the car park and reduce the deterrent to vehicle journeys. Congestion near the car park may even increase. Take care to ensure that the roads near the boundary can handle the increase.

Through-traffic will tend to avoid the charging area, increasing traffic on roads near the boundary, so please ensure that these roads have sufficient capacity, or if they don't, then they too must have charging, perhaps at lower rates, the further away you get from the core charging zone, so we may need a core zone and an adjacent secondary charging zone.

Open data

There is only a need for charging at times and in areas where vehicle speeds are below a target threshold. The Government collects, or should collect, detailed data on existing road traffic, but we are not aware of how detailed this is - whether, for example, it counts vehicles passing specific points in narrow time intervals. We call on the Government to publish all the data in an open, free, machine-readable form, with real-time updates, so that the community can analyse it, suggest where more data are needed, and help to design a solution. With insufficient data, we cannot make further comment on the charging area.

Charging mechanism

The objective of ERP is to reduce congestion, so this logically requires the cordon-based mechanism, charging vehicles whenever they cross a boundary. You misleadingly call a scheme in which vehicles are only charged once per day, regardless of the number of journeys, an "area-based" mechanism, but it is in fact a daily-rate mechanism for crossing a cordon. In the daily-rate mechanism, vehicles are only charged for the first visit and not subsequent visits to the congestion zone. A daily-rate would have only a minimal impact on congestion, particularly because a large portion of the traffic comprises vehicles which visit multiple times per day, including buses and taxis. In a daily-rate mechanism it is also harder to vary the charge based on demand at different times of day.

A charge should be made on both entry and exit during congestion times, otherwise the congestion will be higher in the evening rush hour. Some car owners may drive to work early in the morning, when the charge is low or zero, park their car in a car park and then leave in the evening rush hour, so they must be charged for the evening congestion. Coming to work early shouldn't exempt you from congesting the roads in the evenings.

Taxi drivers or owners may complain about the ERP proposals and embark on their usual protests. The solution is to incentivise them to support ERP. Taxis should be allowed to charge the passenger double the congestion charge for a journey which enters or exits the zone, so that if they enter or leave empty, then their cost will be covered, while if they have passengers in both directions, then they will make a profit on the charge. Only if they are re-empty in both directions will they make a loss. Remember that private cars are more efficient users of road space than taxis, because they only occupy roads when they are actually on a journey.

Charging period

Charges should be calibrated to achieve a target average traffic speed, balancing the supply of road space with the demand for it. If the actual traffic speed is too low, then the charge should be raised. Conversely, if the speed exceeds the target, then lower the charge. Consequently, charges should vary at different times of day based on demand. At certain times of day (particularly overnight) the charge will consequently be zero. The tariff should be reviewed on a regular basis (say, every 3 months) so as to maintain the target traffic speed in response to shifting demand.

There is nothing special about Sundays or public holidays except that demand may be lower then, justifying a zero charge, but if the weekday charging results in a shift in demand to Sundays then congestion charges may be needed. It is important not to raise expectations that Sunday should be a free-for-all day on which congestion does not matter. In some shopping areas, such as Causeway Bay, you may find that congestion is very heavy on Sundays. Stick to the principles and charge only to achieve a target traffic speed, regardless of the day of the week.

Charging level, exemptions and concessions

Resist the political temptation to combine social engineering, vote-buying (in the transport sector) or social welfare with traffic management. If you exempt sectors or charge based on irrelevant factors then those who pay will feel that they are being charged to offset the congestion caused by those who don't, and the scheme will fail to gain public acceptance.

The approach should be strictly based on the road space occupied by a vehicle and agnostic to the number of passengers it carries or could carry. So a car, taxi and light goods minivan should all pay the same amount (call it X), a motorcycle should pay 0.5X, a minibus or a light goods vehicle 1.5X, while a heavy goods vehicle or large bus should pay 2X.

This will still result in a per-passenger cost which is lower for buses than cars, incentivising the use of buses, which are more efficient users of road space except when they are empty or nearly empty. 40 passengers on a bus that pays 2X will pay (via the bus fare) 0.05X each, while a person in a private car with no passengers will pay 20 times that. It is up to bus companies to structure their routes and frequencies to achieve higher occupancy so that the congestion charge is spread more thinly across fares. They may also add a small surcharge for congestion periods, incentivising passengers to use off-peak times.

A per-vehicle charge also incentivises ride-sharing in cars and taxis. However, please see our article Busting HK's road transport cartels (14-Dec-2015). One of the causes of congestion at peak times is that the Government refuses to issue more licenses for public light buses (PLBs) and non-franchised buses, so those who need to travel by road use private cars instead.

Electric vehicles don't produce road-side emissions, but they still occupy road space, slowing down the vehicles behind them, so they should pay the same as other vehicles.

W00433

1022

2016-03-14  
10:51:23

W00432

	<p>The only sensible exception is emergency-services vehicles. Other Government vehicles, including the black, chauffeur-driven limousines that ferry our senior officials and civil servants around, should pay the charge, even though the revenue goes back to another Government department. It would at least impact the departmental budget and make them think about using public transport as most people do.</p> <p>Technology          What you call Dedicated Short-range Radio Communication (DSRC), or put simply, tagging, is the way to go. We also suggest that the tags be easily removed and replaced, so that people who share the usage of a vehicle (such as taxi-drivers who rent a vehicle for a shift) can use their own tag. However, with a tariff based on vehicle size, there must of course be random checking using road-side cameras to ensure that people don't buy a mot or-cycle tag and use it on a heavy goods vehicle.</p> <p>Parking, stopping, and lay-bys          The same DSRC technology should be deployed in all parking meters in HK, so that vehicles are automatically charged when they park and until they leave. All lay-bys should also have meters. There should be a free period of 5 minutes for pick-ups and drop-offs. If your vehicle is still there after 5 minutes then you will be charged, and if it is a lay-by, then at a premium rate (say, double the normal parking rate), because a lay-by is supposed to be a drop-off and pick-up area, not a parking zone, and you need higher availability.</p> <p>This will stop the frequent practice of drivers hogging lay-bys and parking spaces without paying, triggering other users to stop in the road lanes. Charges on parking meters should be raised to meet demand - currently they do not exceed \$2 per 15 minutes, which is, in many places, about one third of the cost of car parks. This often results in criminals controlling the spaces and creaming off the difference in "valet parking" rackets.</p> <p>Road lanes should also be strict no-stopping areas during congestion charging times, because a prime factor in congestion is when drivers stop in a curb-side vehicle lane waiting for their bosses or unloading goods, blocking an entire lane and causing dozens of vehicles to have to manoeuvre around them. Penalties must be raised and enforcement increased.</p> <p>Privacy concern          There can be no real issue surrounding privacy. That was really just an excuse that the Government used the last time it proposed ERP, to avoid tackling vested interests in the transport sector. The reason not to be concerned is that the level of surveillance already open to the Government with its network of CCTV cameras and access to cellphone location data (from triangulation of base stations) means that tracking vehicle number plates does not materially increase the intrusion. If you are on a secret mission then you can always wear a disguise and take public transport using an Octopus card bought with cash.</p> <p>Effectiveness          Obviously the effectiveness should be determined by whether the tariff has achieved the target traffic speed, no more and no less. Yes, the tariff should be reviewed, we suggest quarterly. Numerous factors affect road demand, including weather (demand may be higher in the hot-and-rainy season when walking is less attractive), fuel costs, incomes and alternative transport costs.</p> <p>Complementary measures          Yes:          See our proposals for parking metering and lay-by charges above.          See our proposals in the article Busting HK's Road Transport Cartels (14-Dec-2015)          Abolish First Registration Tax (FRT). Owning a vehicle does not increase road congestion or air pollution. Using it does. See our article Traffic Truths, 1, 13-Apr-2011.          Abolish annual vehicle license fees for the same reason.          To reduce air pollution, reintroduce diesel duty and charge LPG duty too. For vote-buying and socialist reasons, duty on diesel and LPG has been set at zero while petrol duty remains at \$8.06 per litre (unchanged in years). So goods vehicles, taxis, buses and minibuses are not paying for the air pollution and the consequent health care costs and economic losses caused by illness. You probably need to raise the duty level on petrol too.          The revenue from road pricing and taxing LPG, diesel and petrol can offset the revenue lost by abolition of FRT and vehicle license fees.          After limiting road usage with congestion pricing and deterring illegal parking/stopping in vehicle lanes with stiffer fines and enforcement, consider introducing dedicated cycle lanes and/or widening pavements for pedestrians by dropping one of the vehicle lanes. Encourage cycling with bike rental and parking facilities as many major cities have done.          Have your say</p>	
1021	<p>This is an idea whose time has come.</p> <p>I can still remember when Alan Scott proposed ERP 30 years ago (!) when I had only been in HK for a few years, and traffic congestion has only become worse and worse since then.</p> <p>The government and the Transport Department, in particular, should wake up and address the need to pedestrianise this city as much as possible, rather than continue to provide more and more automobile access. The futility of building endless roads was examined, at length, in Robert Caro's "The Power Broker" about how Robert Moses irreparably transformed New York City in the 30s, 40s and 50s: In short, building more and more roads does NOTHING to alleviate traffic in the medium-long term, rather, it only encourages citizens to buy more and more cars. It is truly a hiding to nowhere.</p> <p>In the dense, urban environment of Hong Kong, the answer is mass transit and as many pedestrianised roads, streets and highways as possible. ERP would at least be a baby-step towards discouraging traffic in the most densely populated areas and is a method that has been successfully implemented elsewhere.</p> <p>Let's get on with it!</p>	2016-03-14 10:28:19

W00431

1020	<p>Car driving in Hong Kong should be actively discouraged.</p> <p>Vehicular Traffic (particularly private cars) kills, adds to air pollution, adds to noise pollution, increases congestion and delay and makes the city a far less pleasant place. Car drivers seek more roads, which if made means use of scarce land, makes demands on places such as Victoria park and only leads to yet more traffic (see international experience all over - the more roads, the more the vehicles)</p> <p>If vehicle users and owners want the privilege of being isolated then make them pay. Please bring in stringent electronic road pricing. It is feasible, easy to implement and now cheap to maintain and regulate.</p>	2016-03-14 10:24:48
------	---	------------------------

W00430

1019	<p>I do not agree with ERP as it does not tackle the root problem of the traffic congestion. Standardize all tunnel fees so that most of cross harbour traffic maximize use of the other 2 tunnels and keeps traffic flowing instead of through the Admiralty &amp; Gloucester Road on HK Island.</p> <p>Increase ticketing of PRIVATE cars that wait in lay by areas in heavy used roads in Central, prevent the continued use to stop &amp; pick up outside of New World Tower on Queen's Road Central.</p>	2016-03-14 09:54:29
------	---	------------------------

W00429

1018	<p>I am going for IN vote, the electronic road charging should be introduced long long time ago.</p> <p>I am also, hoping the government should introducing the urban car ownership tax, where people live within 300m of MTR station should pay 4 times of road tax and car import tax.</p>	2016-03-14 08:57:45
------	--	------------------------

W00428

1017	<p>支持計劃 · 舒緩交通 · 全民受惠 · 市民</p>	2016-03-13 22:03:47
------	------------------------------------	------------------------

W00427

1016	<p>Dear Sirs/Madam</p> <p>It is extremely disappointing that the government is considering to put toll in HK as permanent solution to the traffic congestion issues, rather than investing on the infrastructure to solve the problems of shortage of roads.</p> <p>This is a ridiculous solution as the money came from the toll will only go to the pockets of administration and make no benefits in resolving the deep down traffic congestion problems. Besides, car drivers have already paid enough taxes from the car licence, road tax and petrol tax in order to use the car and the road.</p> <p>Moreover, this policy would only benefit transportation companies as the road will be majority used by them. It's absolutely unfair to the citizen of HK. Taking a look on the bus lanes in the morning, what have the bus companies paid to have special lanes and make profit from these privileges?</p> <p>If a government considered this as a solution, those countries were really falling behind the world. Looking at China, except the bridges crossing counties, there is no single road China will charge inside the city due to congestion. Only mediocre government will put tolls on the roads.</p> <p>The only way to solve this congestion issue is to build more flyovers or by-pass and cross harbour tunnels. The government should begin to take back all three cross harbour tunnels and set them free (free of charges) for vehicles. This will be driving the economy to growth.</p> <p>As a conclusion, toll must not be applied in HK.</p> <p>I don't want my personal information be disclosed to any other organisation.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>	2016-03-13 20:33:59
------	---	------------------------

W00426

1015	<p>Introduce electronic road pricing and do so on a usage basis, not on a daily basis. Make sure cars are charged each time they enter and exit a zone, not simply a charge for once a day. There are too many cars on the road, they are dangerous for pedestrians and children, get these cars off the road! Make pricing high enough that people will either walk or take public transportation rather than clog up their roads delivering their tai-tai's to drink afternoon tea.</p> <p>No matter how many roads you build they will always be filled with traffic. More roads = more people buy cars. The only way to solve congestion is to make it too expensive to use liberally for leisure activities. Roads should be for public transportation, taxis, deliveries, fire / police / ambulance and pedestrians safely walking around. We don't need more middle class driving all around clogging up the place!</p>	2016-03-13 15:04:24
------	--	------------------------

W00425

1014	<p>1. Charging area: the ERP area should be the two main roads, Queens's Rd Central(QRC) and Des Voeux Rd Central(DVC) beginning from Gardens Road intersection, ending somewhere near the Pottinger street for QRC and Jubilee street for DVC.</p> <p>Reasons: Most of the traffic congestion in Central is basically created by the lay-off of passengers of private cars and taxis near Landmark Oriental Hotel, the taxi stand in Pedder Street near Central Building, illegal parking along QRC from Pedder Street and Jubilee Street and to a certain extent trucks and lorries illegally parked along DVC. Further up the side streets, illegal parking along Ioe House Street, Wyndham Street, Stanley Street and Wellington Street all created unnecessary congestion. These cars do not only use the road while entering the Central region, they continue to occupy the road space during the day once they are in.</p> <p>2. Charging mechanism : a cordon-based charge should be levied together with either a strong enforcement of clearing the overdue layoff or illegal parking along the roads within this ERP area or erecting parking meters along QRC and DVR inside this ERP area that automatically debit the cars parked via DSRC.</p> <p>3. Charging periods : the government should have data of peak hour traffic to decide on the duration of ERP . Saturday afternoon ,Sunday and public holidays should probably be exempted due to less traffic congestion on these days.</p> <p>4. Differentiated charges should be levied based on vehicle sizes and no exemption should be given to any categories. A HKD10 per entry to the ERP should be levied, the fee should be subject to periodic review to determine the level and effectiveness.</p> <p>5. Technology to be employed : no specific preference. The technology deployed should take into consideration the erection of parking meters along QRC and DVC to levy a hefty sum on the car owners for violating the lay-off and parking regulations.</p> <p>6. Privacy concern : should not be an issue as the loss of privacy is adequately compensated by the benefit generated to the majority of the general public.</p> <p>7. Effectiveness : the measure of effectiveness could be monitored based on the average traffic flow or the average speed of traffic during the period of ERP and of course the ERP charge levels should be regularly reviewed.</p> <p>8. Complementary measures : as stated in point number 1 above, one of the contributing reasons for traffic congestion in Central is the overdue lay-off and illegal parking in the main roads and side roads in the prescribed area in Central. Therefore, tough measures should be petered out to those who violate the parking regulations within the ERP area, suggestions such as fines of twice the amount outside of the ERP area and penalty points to be deducted from the driver's account which results in suspension of the driving licence.</p>		2016-03-13 14:52:35
1013	<p>I think ERP is a good idea and we should make the pricing very high. Rich people won't change their habits for just a few dollars. Even more important is to enforce the current laws. I wait for a shuttle every day on Queens Road Central at Duddell Street across from Landmark. Cars sit there for 15 minutes waiting for their owners. They block a full lane of traffic. The other lane is blocked by cars waiting to pull into Landmark Mandarin. So QRC is only one lane wide for most of the peak hours. Therefore traffic backs up almost to Admiralty.</p> <p>This happens elsewhere around town as well police and government knows the problem but choose to ignore the tycoons and their chauffeurs blocking traffic lanes.</p> <p>So ERP will only keep middle class driver out of Central. The tycoons already don't care who is inconvenienced as long as they have their car waiting for them. So please fix the current lack of law enforcement along with ERP.</p> <p>Thank you</p>		2016-03-13 14:01:14
1012	<p>利用自動车牌識別科技(識別车牌號碼(和車輛中的人數)進行收費，假設收費是15元，而車輛中有4人，每人的收費是3元7角5仙，而四捨五人後是3元8角，未來可以用以上方式進行收費。</p>		2016-03-13 11:53:23

W00424

W00423

W00422

1011

對於政府建議在中環及鄰近地區推行電子道路收費先導計劃並就細節諮詢公眾三個月，本人希望提出意見：

本人今年年卅4歲，畢業於香港大學商學院屬於中區階層，每年需要繳稅三萬多，需要供養父母同時亦需要供樓、供MPF、供保險，現在的情況可以說是人不敷支。對於政府建議在中環及鄰近地區推行電子道路收費的先導計劃，本人極力反對政府在現在這個經濟不景氣的環境之下，將改善道路措施的重任推卸到市民身上。

如果政府希望改善道路措施情況，其實可以有很多其他可行及建設性方法可舒緩現在塞車情況，而不是把責任直接轉嫁至市民身上，令市民要承擔這不公平的額外徵收道路費用，我們這些小市民每年也要繳稅，提供合標準道路建設是政府應有的負責，我們已經要繳稅、供樓、供MPF、供養父母、供保險，在人不敷支的情況之下，如政府堅持推行這不公平的額外徵收道路費用，只會令我們市民百上加斤。

另外，電子道路收費計劃只可能適合於外國實行，未必適合香港這地小人多的地方實行，因為在外地地方較大，道路使用者很多時也有很多道路選擇可以到目的地；相反，香港就完全不同，在中環一帶的道路，未必有充足的道路選擇給予道路使用者選擇使用，如政府真的要推行此電子道路收費先導計劃，則實際是迫著道路使用者徵收額外收費，變成政府只是單方面的增加收入，而實際卻不見得可以真正舒緩到塞車的情況。

前文已提及，其實有很多建設性方法可舒緩塞車情況，建議如下：

- 1) 東區隧道海底隧道政府將收回，建議政府可考慮把東區海底隧道的收費降低至一定水平，例如：由現在 \$25的收費調低至 \$ 15，這樣一定可以舒緩到紅磡海底隧道一帶的塞車情況。
- 2) 另外建議東區海底隧道及紅磡海底隧道的收費處可統一以八達通自動收費，來代替現在一直使用的舊方式 - 以現金收費支付方式，以縮短收費的程序，相信可大大舒緩到紅磡海底隧道的塞車情況。

希望政府真的可以提出有建設性方案，而不是只顧香港市民的利益，只看顧政府的收益，藉著道路收費而增加政府收益。

如有問題可與本人聯繫

林小姐

2016-03-13  
10:43:13

W00421

1010

ERP should have been introduced years ago. We can all see how well it works in Singapore and London, and how badly congested HK roads are, which is in at least part because road users are not charged for the damage and impact they have on HK.

So yes, I am in favour of ERP - and don't set the price too low, as you have done with parking tickets and the central tunnel - clearly shown by the blocked roads due to parking and queuing for the tunnel.

2016-03-13  
04:44:46

W00420

1009

對於政府建議在中環及鄰近地區推行電子道路收費先導計劃並就細節諮詢公眾三個月，本人希望提出意見：

本人今年年卅4歲，畢業於香港大學商學院屬於中區階層，每年需要繳稅三萬多，需要供養父母同時亦需要供樓、供MPF、供保險，現在的情況可以說是人不敷支。對於政府建議在中環及鄰近地區推行電子道路收費的先導計劃，本人極力反對政府在現在這個經濟不景氣的環境之下，將改善道路措施的重任推卸到市民身上。

如果政府希望改善道路措施情況，其實可以有很多其他可行及建設性方法可舒緩現在塞車情況，而不是把責任直接轉嫁至市民身上，令市民要承擔這不公平的額外徵收道路費用，我們這些小市民每年也要繳稅，提供合標準道路建設是政府應有的負責，我們已經要繳稅、供樓、供MPF、供養父母、供保險，在人不敷支的情況之下，如政府堅持推行這不公平的額外徵收道路費用，只會令我們市民百上加斤。

另外，電子道路收費計劃只可能適合於外國實行，未必適合香港這地小人多的地方實行，因為在外地地方較大，道路使用者很多時也有很多道路選擇可以到目的地；相反，香港就完全不同，在中環一帶的道路，未必有充足的道路選擇給予道路使用者選擇使用，如政府真的要推行此電子道路收費先導計劃，則實際是迫著道路使用者徵收額外收費，變成政府只是單方面的增加收入，而實際卻不見得可以真正舒緩到塞車的情況。

前文已提及，其實有很多建設性方法可舒緩塞車情況，建議如下：

- 1) 東區隧道海底隧道政府將收回，建議政府可考慮把東區海底隧道的收費降低至一定水平，例如：由現在 \$25的收費調低至 \$ 15，這樣一定可以舒緩到紅磡海底隧道一帶的塞車情況。
- 2) 另外建議東區海底隧道及紅磡海底隧道的收費處可統一以八達通自動收費，來代替現在一直使用的舊方式 - 以現金收費支付方式，以縮短收費的程序，相信可大大舒緩到紅磡海底隧道的塞車情況。

希望政府真的可以提出有建設性方案，而不是只顧香港市民的利益，只看顧政府的收益，藉著道路收費而增加政府收益。

如有問題可與本人聯繫

林小姐

2016-03-12  
23:09:27

W00419

1008	<p>1. Electronic road pricing should be based on vehicle usage and to location and time/day of travel.</p> <p>2. Buses (assuming average passengers at 15) should be charged on the basis of approximately three times a private car, minibuses two times. (ie Charge per individual road user should favour public transport). Licenced taxis to be charged two thirds of private car to give taxis priority over private ones</p> <p>3. Tunnel usage prices to be more equalised -- price ratio depending on traffic flows issues and be variable. Wanchai-Central tunnel be priced (when opened) at not less than the average cross-harbour toll</p> <p>4. Fuel taxes -- petrol ,diesel,LPG -- equalised and first registration tax preferences for electric/hybrid abolished</p> <p>5.. Free parking for government officials and quasi-government entities (inc schools, universities) to be abolished and charges levied at rates applying locally.</p> <p>6. All vehicles using public roads to have electronic tags -- but only to record pricing points not location.</p> <p>P.A. Bowring ID:</p>		2016-03-12 22:36:03
1007	<p>Disagree strongly with the lame excuse that introducing electronic road pricing will make Central a much more pleasant and pedestrian friendly pace by reducing congestion. The real concern is congestion at peak hours and, as anyone who uses public transport will testify, the main culprits at those times are buses, taxis and chauffeur driven cars.</p> <p>There are higher priorities that will have more immediate beneficial effects that should be implemented first - possibly removing the perceived need for electronic road pricing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. cross harbour tunnels - alleviate congestion by adjusting tariffs</li><li>2. enforce non-stopping zones and remove chauffeured cars blocking roads around Central</li><li>3. convert Queen's Road Central between Ice House Street and Queen Victoria Street from a through road to a pedestrian zone</li><li>4. replace any official engaged in the design of roads or placement of road signs who does not drive a private car in the relevant areas by officials who do so</li><li>5. Wait to see how the Central Bypass works to remove through traffic from Central - it is unlikely to have a huge effect as Connaught Road/Gloucester Road are the only through streets, so the above measures should be taken first.</li></ol> <p>Let's be brave and give it a go, and not fall back on repeating past failed policy mistakes. Hong Kong is not London!</p> <p>Thank you Anonymous Mid-Levels, Hong Kong 12 March 2016</p>		2016-03-12 22:08:59
1008	<p>Please implement a proper congestion charge, based on the number of crossings, not one crossing per day. Start charging duty on LPG. Increase the charge on diesel to proper levels. Start charging people for stopping in lay-bys. Stop exempting special interests like taxis, buses and government vehicles. Increase the number of permits for private buses.</p>		2016-03-12 19:58:48

W00418

W00417



The below proposal for ERP was published on Webb site blog. I support the suggestions contained therein.

#### Charging area

For any chosen area of HK, some traffic normally passes through that area to destinations outside it (through-traffic) while other traffic has a destination within that area (destination traffic). If the charging area is too small, then some of the destination traffic will shift its destination to just outside the boundary, rather than not coming at all. For example, if you draw a small area with a car park just outside it, then that will boost revenue for the car park and reduce the deterrent to vehicle journeys. Congestion near the car park may even increase. Take care to ensure that the roads near the boundary can handle the increase. Through-traffic will tend to avoid the charging area, increasing traffic on roads near the boundary, so please ensure that these roads have sufficient capacity, or if they don't, then they too must have charging, perhaps at lower rates, the further away you get from the core charging zone, so we may need a core zone and an adjacent secondary charging zone.

#### Open data

There is only a need for charging at times and in areas where vehicle speeds are below a target threshold. The Government collects, or should collect, detailed data on existing road traffic, but we are not aware of how detailed this is - whether, for example, it counts vehicles passing specific points in narrow time intervals. We call on the Government to publish all the data in an open, free, machine-readable form, with real-time updates, so that the community can analyse it, suggest where more data are needed, and help to design a solution. With insufficient data, we cannot make further comment on the charging area.

#### Charging mechanism

The objective of ERP is to reduce congestion, so this logically requires the cordon-based mechanism, charging vehicles whenever they cross a boundary. You misleadingly call a scheme in which vehicles are only charged once per day, regardless of the number of journeys, an "area-based" mechanism, but it is in fact a daily-rate mechanism for crossing a cordon. In the daily-rate mechanism, vehicles are only charged for the first visit and not subsequent visits to the congestion zone. A daily-rate would have only a minimal impact on congestion, particularly because a large portion of the traffic comprises vehicles which visit multiple times per day, including buses and taxis. In a daily-rate mechanism it is also harder to vary the charge based on demand at different times of day.

A charge should be made on both entry and exit during congestion times, otherwise the congestion will be higher in the evening rush hour. Some car owners may drive to work early in the morning, when the charge is low or zero, park their car in a car park and then leave in the evening rush hour, so they must be charged for the evening congestion. Coming to work early shouldn't exempt you from congesting the roads in the evenings.

#### Traffic in Queen's Road Central

#### Taxis

Taxi drivers or owners may complain about the ERP proposals and embark on their usual protests. The solution is to incentivise them to support ERP. Taxis should be allowed to charge the passenger double the congestion charge for a journey which enters or exits the zone, so that if they enter or leave empty, then their cost will be covered, while if they have passengers in both directions, then they will make a profit on the charge. Only if they are empty in both directions will they make a loss. Remember that private cars are more efficient users of road space than taxis, because they only occupy roads when they are actually on a journey.

#### Charging period

Charges should be calibrated to achieve a target average traffic speed, balancing the supply of road space with the demand for it. If the actual traffic speed is too low, then the charge should be raised. Conversely, if the speed exceeds the target, then lower the charge. Consequently, charges should vary at different times of day based on demand. At certain times of day (particularly overnight) the charge will consequently be zero. The tariff should be reviewed on a regular basis (say, every 3 months) so as to maintain the target traffic speed in response to shifting demand.

There is nothing special about Sundays or public holidays except that demand may be lower then, justifying a zero charge, but if the weekday charging results in a shift in demand to Sundays then congestion charges may be needed. It is important not to raise expectations that Sunday should be a free-for-all day on which congestion does not matter. In some shopping areas, such as Causeway Bay, you may find that congestion is very heavy on Sundays. Stick to the principles and charge only to achieve a target traffic speed, regardless of the day of the week.

#### Charging level, exemptions and concessions

Resist the political temptation to combine social engineering, vote-buying (in the transport sector) or social welfare with traffic management. If you exempt sectors or charge based on irrelevant factors then those who pay will feel that they are being charged to offset the congestion caused by those who don't, and the scheme will fail to gain public acceptance.

The approach should be strictly based on the road space occupied by a vehicle and agnostic to the number of passengers it carries or could carry. So a car, taxi and light goods minivan should all pay the same amount (call it X), a motorcycle should pay 0.5X, a minibus or a light goods vehicle 1.5X, while a heavy goods vehicle or large bus should pay 2X.

This will still result in a per-passenger cost which is lower for buses than cars, incentivising the use of buses, which are more efficient users of road space except when they are empty or nearly empty. 40 passengers on a bus that pays 2X will pay (via the bus fare) 0.05X each, while a person in a private car with no passengers will pay 20 times that. It is up to bus companies to structure their routes and frequencies to achieve higher occupancy so that the congestion charge is spread more thinly across fares. They may also add a small surcharge for congestion periods, incentivising passengers to use off-peak times.

A per-vehicle charge also incentivises ride-sharing in cars and taxis. However, please see our article Busting HK's road transport cartels (14-Dec-2015). One of the causes of congestion at peak times is that the Government refuses to issue more licenses for public light buses (PLBs) and non-franchised buses, so those who need to travel by road use private cars instead.

Electric vehicles don't produce road-side emissions, but they still occupy road space, slowing down the vehicles behind them, so they should pay the same as other vehicles.

The only sensible exception is emergency-services vehicles. Other Government vehicles, including the black, chauffeur-driven limousines that ferry our senior officials and civil servants around, should pay the charge, even though the revenue goes back to another Government department. It would at least impact the departmental budget and make them think about using public transport as most people do.

#### Technology

W00416

1005

2016-03-12  
18:49:50

What you call Dedicated Short-range Radio Communication (DSRC), or put simply, tagging, is the way to go. We also suggest that the tags be easily removed and replaced, so that people who share the usage of a vehicle (such as taxi-drivers who rent a vehicle for a shift) can use their own tag. However, with a tariff based on vehicle size, there must of course be random checking using road-side cameras to ensure that people don't buy a motor-cycle tag and use it on a heavy goods vehicle.

Parking, stopping, and lay-bys

The same DSRC technology should be deployed in all parking meters in HK, so that vehicles are automatically charged when they park and until they leave. All lay-bys should also have meters. There should be a free period of 5 minutes for pick-ups and drop-offs. If your vehicle is still there after 5 minutes then you will be charged, and if it is a lay-by, then at a premium rate (say, double the normal parking rate), because a lay-by is supposed to be a drop-off and pick-up area, not a parking zone, and you need higher availability.

This will stop the frequent practice of drivers hogging lay-bys and parking spaces without paying, triggering other users to stop in the road lanes. Charges on parking meters should be raised to meet demand - currently they do not exceed \$2 per 15 minutes, which is, in many places, about one third of the cost of car parks. This often results in criminals controlling the spaces and creaming off the difference in "valet parking" rackets.

Road lanes should also be strict no-stopping areas during congestion charging times, because a prime factor in congestion is when drivers stop in a curb-side vehicle lane waiting for their bosses or unloading goods, blocking an entire lane and causing dozens of vehicles to have to manoeuvre around them. Penalties must be raised and enforcement increased.

Privacy concern

There can be no real issue surrounding privacy. That was really just an excuse that the Government used the last time it proposed ERP, to avoid tackling vested interests in the transport sector. The reason not to be concerned is that the level of surveillance already open to the Government with its network of CCTV cameras and access to cellphone location data (from triangulation of base stations) means that tracking vehicle number plates does not materially increase the intrusion. If you are on a secret mission then you can always wear a disguise and take public transport using an Octopus card bought with cash.

Effectiveness

Obviously the effectiveness should be determined by whether the tariff has achieved the target traffic speed, no more and no less. Yes, the tariff should be reviewed, we suggest quarterly. Numerous factors affect road demand, including weather (demand may be higher in the hot-and-rainy season when walking is less attractive), fuel costs, incomes and alternative transport costs.

Complementary measures

Yes:

See our proposals for parking metering and lay-by charges above.

See our proposals in the article Busting HK's Road Transport Cartels (14-Dec-2015)

Abolish First Registration Tax (FRT). Owning a vehicle does not increase road congestion or air pollution. Using it does. See our article Traffic Truths, 1, 13-Apr-2011.

Abolish annual vehicle license fees for the same reason.

To reduce air pollution, reintroduce diesel duty and charge LPG duty too. For vote-buying and socialist reasons, duty on diesel and LPG has been set at zero while petrol duty remains at \$6.06 per litre (unchanged in years).

So goods vehicles, taxis, buses and minibuses are not paying for the air pollution and the consequent health care costs and economic losses caused by illness. You probably need to raise the duty level on petrol too.

The revenue from road pricing and taxing LPG, diesel and petrol can offset the revenue lost by abolition of FRT and vehicle license fees.

After limiting road usage with congestion pricing and deterring illegal parking/stopping in vehicle lanes with stiffer fines and enforcement, consider introducing dedicated cycle lanes and/or widening pavements for pedestrians by dropping one of the vehicle lanes. Encourage cycling with bike rental and parking facilities as many major cities have done.

W00415

1004

Charging area

For any chosen area of HK, some traffic normally passes through that area to destinations outside it (through-traffic) while other traffic has a destination within that area (destination traffic). If the charging area is too small, then some of the destination traffic will shift its destination to just outside the boundary, rather than not coming at all. For example, if you draw a small area with a car park just outside it, then that will boost revenue for the car park and reduce the deterrent to vehicle journeys. Congestion near the car park may even increase. Take care to ensure that the roads near the boundary can handle the increase.

Through-traffic will tend to avoid the charging area, increasing traffic on roads near the boundary, so please ensure that these roads have sufficient capacity, or if they don't, then they too must have charging, perhaps at lower rates, the further away you get from the core charging zone, so we may need a core zone and an adjacent secondary charging zone.

Open data

There is only a need for charging at times and in areas where vehicle speeds are below a target threshold. The Government collects, or should collect, detailed data on existing road traffic, but we are not aware of how detailed this is - whether, for example, it counts vehicles passing specific points in narrow time intervals. We call on the Government to publish all the data in an open, free, machine-readable form, with real-time updates, so that the community can analyse it, suggest where more data are needed, and help to design a solution. With insufficient data, we cannot make further comment on the charging area.

Charging mechanism

The objective of ERP is to reduce congestion, so this logically requires the cordon-based mechanism, charging vehicles whenever they cross a boundary. You misleadingly call a scheme in which vehicles are only charged once per day, regardless of the number of journeys, an "area-based" mechanism, but it is in fact a daily-rate mechanism for crossing a cordon. In the daily-rate mechanism, vehicles are only charged for the first visit and not subsequent visits to the congestion zone. A daily-rate would have only a minimal impact on congestion, particularly because a large portion of the traffic comprises vehicles which visit multiple times per day, including buses and taxis. In a daily-rate mechanism it is also harder to vary the charge based on demand at different times of day.

A charge should be made on both entry and exit during congestion times, otherwise the congestion will be higher in the evening rush hour. Some car owners may drive to work early in the morning, when the charge is low or zero, park their car in a car park and then leave in the evening rush hour, so they must be charged for the evening congestion. Coming to work early shouldn't exempt you from congesting the roads in the evenings.

Traffic in Queen's Road Central

Taxis

Taxi drivers or owners may complain about the ERP proposals and embark on their usual protests. The solution is to incentivise them to support ERP. Taxis should be allowed to charge the passenger double the congestion charge for a journey which enters or exits the zone, so that if they enter or leave empty, then their cost will be covered, while if they have passengers in both directions, then they will make a profit on the charge. Only if they are empty in both directions will they make a loss. Remember that private cars are more efficient users of road space than taxis, because they only occupy roads when they are actually on a journey.

Charging period

Charges should be calibrated to achieve a target average traffic speed, balancing the supply of road space with the demand for it. If the actual traffic speed is too low, then the charge should be raised. Conversely, if the speed exceeds the target, then lower the charge. Consequently, charges should vary at different times of day based on demand. At certain times of day (particularly overnight) the charge will consequently be zero. The tariff should be reviewed on a regular basis (say, every 3 months) so as to maintain the target traffic speed in response to shifting demand.

There is nothing special about Sundays or public holidays except that demand may be lower then, justifying a zero charge, but if the weekday charging results in a shift in demand to Sundays then congestion charges may be needed. It is important not to raise expectations that Sunday should be a free-for-all day on which congestion does not matter. In some shopping areas, such as Causeway Bay, you may find that congestion is very heavy on Sundays. Stick to the principles and charge only to achieve a target traffic speed, regardless of the day of the week.

Charging level, exemptions and concessions

Resist the political temptation to combine social engineering, vote-buying (in the transport sector) or social welfare with traffic management. If you exempt sectors or charge based on irrelevant factors then those who pay will feel that they are being charged to offset the congestion caused by those who don't, and the scheme will fail to gain public acceptance.

The approach should be strictly based on the road space occupied by a vehicle and agnostic to the number of passengers it carries or could carry. So a car, taxi and light goods minivan should all pay the same amount (call it X), a motorcycle should pay 0.5X, a minibus or a light goods vehicle 1.5X, while a heavy goods vehicle or large bus should pay 2X.

This will still result in a per-passenger cost which is lower for buses than cars, incentivising the use of buses, which are more efficient users of road space except when they are empty or nearly empty. 40 passengers on a bus that pays 2X will pay (via the bus fare) 0.05X each, while a person in a private car with no passengers will pay 20 times that. It is up to bus companies to structure their routes and frequencies to achieve higher occupancy so that the congestion charge is spread more thinly across fares. They may also add a small surcharge for congestion periods, incentivising passengers to use off-peak times.

2016-03-12  
18:03:01

A per-vehicle charge also incentivises ride-sharing in cars and taxis. However, please see our article Busting HK's road transport cartels (14-Dec-2015). One of the causes of congestion at peak times is that the Government refuses to issue more licenses for public light buses (PLBs) and non-franchised buses, so those who need to travel by road use private cars instead.

Electric vehicles don't produce road-side emissions, but they still occupy road space, slowing down the vehicles behind them, so they should pay the same as other vehicles.

The only sensible exception is emergency-services vehicles. Other Government vehicles, including the black, chauffeur-driven limousines that ferry our senior officials and civil servants around, should pay the charge, even though the revenue goes back to another Government department. It would at least impact the departmental budget and make them think about using public transport as most people do.  
Technology

What you call Dedicated Short-range Radio Communication (DSRC), or put simply, tagging, is the way to go. We also suggest that the tags be easily removed and replaced, so that people who share the usage of a vehicle (such as taxi-drivers who rent a vehicle for a shift) can use their own tag. However, with a tariff based on vehicle size, there must of course be random checking using road-side cameras to ensure that people don't buy a mot or-cycle tag and use it on a heavy goods vehicle.

Parking, stopping, and lay-bys

The same DSRC technology should be deployed in all parking meters in HK, so that vehicles are automatically charged when they park and until they leave. All lay-bys should also have meters. There should be a free period of 5 minutes for pick-ups and drop-offs. If your vehicle is still there after 5 minutes then you will be charged, and if it is a lay-by, then at a premium rate (say, double the normal parking rate), because a lay-by is supposed to be a drop-off and pick-up area, not a parking zone, and you need higher availability.

This will stop the frequent practice of drivers hogging lay-bys and parking spaces without paying, triggering other users to stop in the road lanes. Charges on parking meters should be raised to meet demand - currently they do not exceed \$2 per 15 minutes, which is, in many places, about one third of the cost of car parks. This often results in criminals controlling the spaces and creaming off the difference in "valet parking" rackets.

Road lanes should also be strict no-stopping areas during congestion charging times, because a prime factor in congestion is when drivers stop in a curb-side vehicle lane waiting for their bosses or unloading goods, blocking an entire lane and causing dozens of vehicles to have to manoeuvre around them. Penalties must be raised and enforcement increased.  
Privacy concern

There can be no real issue surrounding privacy. That was really just an excuse that the Government used the last time it proposed ERP, to avoid tackling vested interests in the transport sector. The reason not to be concerned is that the level of surveillance already open to the Government with its network of CCTV cameras and access to cellphone location data (from triangulation of base stations) means that tracking vehicle number plates does not materially increase the intrusion. If you are on a secret mission then you can always wear a disguise and take public transport using an Octopus card bought with cash.  
Effectiveness

Obviously the effectiveness should be determined by whether the tariff has achieved the target traffic speed, no more and no less. Yes, the tariff should be reviewed, we suggest quarterly. Numerous factors affect road demand, including weather (demand may be higher in the hot-and-rainy season when walking is less attractive), fuel costs, incomes and alternative transport costs.  
Complementary measures

Yes:

See our proposals for parking metering and lay-by charges above.

See our proposals in the article Busting HK's Road Transport Cartels (14-Dec-2015)

Abolish First Registration Tax (FRT). Owning a vehicle does not increase road congestion or air pollution. Using it does. See our article Traffic Truths, 1, 13-Apr-2011.

Abolish annual vehicle license fees for the same reason.

To reduce air pollution, reintroduce diesel duty and charge LPG duty too. For vote-buying and socialist reasons, duty on diesel and LPG has been set at zero while petrol duty remains at \$8.06 per litre (unchanged in years).

So goods vehicles, taxis, buses and minibuses are not paying for the air pollution and the consequent health care costs and economic losses caused by illness. You probably need to raise the duty level on petrol too.

The revenue from road pricing and taxing LPG, diesel and petrol can offset the revenue lost by abolition of FRT and vehicle license fees.

After limiting road usage with congestion pricing and deterring illegal parking/stopping in vehicle lanes with stiffer fines and enforcement, consider introducing dedicated cycle lanes and/or widening pavements for pedestrians by dropping one of the vehicle lanes. Encourage cycling with bike rental and parking facilities as many major cities have done.

W00414

1003 I have read Webb.com and would agree with nearly all his comments. In particular, I would agree that each journey should be treated separately. It is only by that method, will users of central consider whether they really need to be there; and if they do, should they use a car.

2016-03-12  
17:16:13

W00413

1002 Technology: ANPR should be used as in London for the Congestion Charge (HKP and TD already use it for detecting unlicensed vehicles). Charges should be based on the vehicle type and ANPR can identify this from the number plate. Anyone with a non-standard number/vanity plate should be charged the maximum! [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Automatic\\_number\\_plate\\_recognition](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Automatic_number_plate_recognition)

2016-03-12  
17:07:53

W00412

1001 I totally agree with the policies set out by David Webb.

2016-03-12  
16:43:37

W00411

1000	Generally speaking I support the recommendations and courses of action which are outlined in Webb-Site views. Good consultation in its development is essential to include all aspects of Hong Kong transportation and ensure fairness. With current IT capabilities ERP should be flexible and respond to variable rates as well as changes in traffic movements over time. Hong Kong should benefit enormously from this development including not least quality of life, image and so on.	2016-03-12 16:37:43
000	Please proceed	2016-03-12 16:22:23
000	A good way forward.	2016-03-12 16:20:58

W00410

W00409

I concur with the comments put forward by Webb-site.com to the Electronic Road Pricing Pilot Scheme public engagement document.

We support this. Road pricing is not in fact a new concept in HK - there are already charges for various tunnels, bridges and the Route 3 Country Park Section. Lessons can be learned from the implementation of those. It is remarkable that the tolls on all of those are the same at every hour of the day. This is not optimal.

Even the MTR has an early-bird discount (or if you prefer, a premium outside that period) in urban areas to shift demand, although they don't follow through with differential pricing around the evening rush hour. Remember, you stripped the MTRC of its fare autonomy some years ago, and if you won't let them increase fares at peak times then they can't discount at off-peak times without losing revenue.

In response to the specific questions in Appendix 4:

#### Charging area

For any chosen area of HK, some traffic normally passes through that area to destinations outside it (through-traffic) while other traffic has a destination within that area (destination traffic). If the charging area is too small, then some of the destination traffic will shift its destination to just outside the boundary, rather than not coming at all. For example, if you draw a small area with a car park just outside it, then that will boost revenue for the car park and reduce the deterrent to vehicle journeys. Congestion near the car park may even increase. Take care to ensure that the roads near the boundary can handle the increase.

Through-traffic will tend to avoid the charging area, increasing traffic on roads near the boundary, so please ensure that these roads have sufficient capacity, or if they don't, then they too must have charging, perhaps at lower rates, the further away you get from the core charging zone, so we may need a core zone and an adjacent secondary charging zone.

#### Open data

There is only a need for charging at times and in areas where vehicle speeds are below a target threshold. The Government collects, or should collect, detailed data on existing road traffic, but we are not aware of how detailed this is - whether, for example, it counts vehicles passing specific points in narrow time intervals. We call on the Government to publish all the data in an open, free, machine-readable form, with real-time updates, so that the community can analyse it, suggest where more data are needed, and help to design a solution. With insufficient data, we cannot make further comment on the charging area.

#### Charging mechanism

The objective of ERP is to reduce congestion, so this logically requires the cordon-based mechanism, charging vehicles whenever they cross a boundary. You misleadingly call a scheme in which vehicles are only charged once per day, regardless of the number of journeys, an "area-based" mechanism, but it is in fact a daily-rate mechanism for crossing a cordon. In the daily-rate mechanism, vehicles are only charged for the first visit and not subsequent visits to the congestion zone. A daily-rate would have only a minimal impact on congestion, particularly because a large portion of the traffic comprises vehicles which visit multiple times per day, including buses and taxis. In a daily-rate mechanism it is also harder to vary the charge based on demand at different times of day.

A charge should be made on both entry and exit during congestion times, otherwise the congestion will be higher in the evening rush hour. Some car owners may drive to work early in the morning, when the charge is low or zero, park their car in a car park and then leave in the evening rush hour, so they must be charged for the evening congestion. Coming to work early shouldn't exempt you from congesting the roads in the evenings.

#### Traffic in Queen's Road Central

##### Taxis

Taxi drivers or owners may complain about the ERP proposals and embark on their usual protests. The solution is to incentivise them to support ERP. Taxis should be allowed to charge the passenger double the congestion charge for a journey which enters or exits the zone, so that if they enter or leave empty, then their cost will be covered, while if they have passengers in both directions, then they will make a profit on the charge. Only if they are empty in both directions will they make a loss. Remember that private cars are more efficient users of road space than taxis, because they only occupy roads when they are actually on a journey.

##### Charging period

Charges should be calibrated to achieve a target average traffic speed, balancing the supply of road space with the demand for it. If the actual traffic speed is too low, then the charge should be raised. Conversely, if the speed exceeds the target, then lower the charge. Consequently, charges should vary at different times of day based on demand. At certain times of day (particularly overnight) the charge will consequently be zero. The tariff should be reviewed on a regular basis (say, every 3 months) so as to maintain the target traffic speed in response to shifting demand.

There is nothing special about Sundays or public holidays except that demand may be lower then, justifying a zero charge, but if the weekday charging results in a shift in demand to Sundays then congestion charges may be needed. It is important not to raise expectations that Sunday should be a free-for-all day on which congestion does not matter. In some shopping areas, such as Causeway Bay, you may find that congestion is very heavy on Sundays. Stick to the principles and charge only to achieve a target traffic speed, regardless of the day of the week.

##### Charging level, exemptions and concessions

Resist the political temptation to combine social engineering, vote-buying (in the transport sector) or social welfare with traffic management. If you exempt sectors or charge based on irrelevant factors then those who pay will feel that they are being charged to offset the congestion caused by those who don't, and the scheme will fail to gain public acceptance.

The approach should be strictly based on the road space occupied by a vehicle and agnostic to the number of passengers it carries or could carry. So a car, taxi and light goods minivan should all pay the same amount (call it X), a motorcycle should pay 0.5X, a minibus or a light goods vehicle 1.5X, while a heavy goods vehicle or large bus should pay 2X.

This will still result in a per-passenger cost which is lower for buses than cars, incentivising the use of buses, which are more efficient users of road space except when they are empty or nearly empty. 40 passengers on a bus that pays 2X will pay (via the bus fare) 0.05X each, while a person in a private car with no passengers will pay 20 times that. It is up to bus companies to structure their routes and frequencies to achieve higher occupancy so that the congestion charge is spread more thinly across fares. They may also add a small surcharge for congestion periods, incentivising passengers to use off-peak times.

W00408

997

2016-03-12  
15:48:36

A per-vehicle charge also incentivises ride-sharing in cars and taxis. However, please see our article Busting HK's road transport cartels (14-Dec-2015). One of the causes of congestion at peak times is that the Government refuses to issue more licenses for public light buses (PLBs) and non-franchised buses, so those who need to travel by road use private cars instead.

Electric vehicles don't produce road-side emissions, but they still occupy road space, slowing down the vehicles behind them, so they should pay the same as other vehicles.

The only sensible exception is emergency-services vehicles. Other Government vehicles, including the black, chauffeur-driven limousines that ferry our senior officials and civil servants around, should pay the charge, even though the revenue goes back to another Government department. It would at least impact the departmental budget and make them think about using public transport as most people do.

#### Technology

What you call Dedicated Short-range Radio Communication (DSRC), or put simply, tagging, is the way to go. We also suggest that the tags be easily removed and replaced, so that people who share the usage of a vehicle (such as taxi-drivers who rent a vehicle for a shift) can use their own tag. However, with a tariff based on vehicle size, there must of course be random checking using road-side cameras to ensure that people don't buy a mot or-cycle tag and use it on a heavy goods vehicle.

Parking, stopping, and lay-bys

The same DSRC technology should be deployed in all parking meters in HK, so that vehicles are automatically charged when they park and until they leave. All lay-bys should also have meters. There should be a free period of 5 minutes for pick-ups and drop-offs. If your vehicle is still there after 5 minutes then you will be charged, and if it is a lay-by, then at a premium rate (say, double the normal parking rate), because a lay-by is supposed to be a drop-off and pick-up area, not a parking zone, and you need higher availability.

This will stop the frequent practice of drivers hogging lay-bys and parking spaces without paying, triggering other users to stop in the road lanes. Charges on parking meters should be raised to meet demand - currently they do not exceed \$2 per 15 minutes, which is, in many places, about one third of the cost of car parks. This often results in criminals controlling the spaces and creaming off the difference in "valet parking" rackets.

Road lanes should also be strict no-stopping areas during congestion charging times, because a prime factor in congestion is when drivers stop in a curb-side vehicle lane waiting for their bosses or unloading goods, blocking an entire lane and causing dozens of vehicles to have to manoeuvre around them. Penalties must be raised and enforcement increased.

#### Privacy concern

There can be no real issue surrounding privacy. That was really just an excuse that the Government used the last time it proposed ERP, to avoid tackling vested interests in the transport sector. The reason not to be concerned is that the level of surveillance already open to the Government with its network of CCTV cameras and access to cellphone location data (from triangulation of base stations) means that tracking vehicle number plates does not materially increase the intrusion. If you are on a secret mission then you can always wear a disguise and take public transport using an Octopus card bought with cash.

#### Effectiveness

Obviously the effectiveness should be determined by whether the tariff has achieved the target traffic speed, no more and no less. Yes, the tariff should be reviewed, we suggest quarterly. Numerous factors affect road demand, including weather (demand may be higher in the hot-and-rainy season when walking is less attractive), fuel costs, incomes and alternative transport costs.

#### Complementary measures

Yes:

See our proposals for parking metering and lay-by charges above.

See our proposals in the article Busting HK's Road Transport Cartels (14-Dec-2015)

Abolish First Registration Tax (FRT). Owning a vehicle does not increase road congestion or air pollution. Using it does. See our article Traffic Truths, 1, 13-Apr-2011.

Abolish annual vehicle license fees for the same reason.

To reduce air pollution, reintroduce diesel duty and charge LPG duty too. For vote-buying and socialist reasons, duty on diesel and LPG has been set at zero while petrol duty remains at \$8.06 per litre (unchanged in years). So goods vehicles, taxis, buses and minibuses are not paying for the air pollution and the consequent health care costs and economic losses caused by illness. You probably need to raise the duty level on petrol too.

The revenue from road pricing and taxing LPG, diesel and petrol can offset the revenue lost by abolition of FRT and vehicle license fees.

After limiting road usage with congestion pricing and deterring illegal parking/stopping in vehicle lanes with stiffer fines and enforcement, consider introducing dedicated cycle lanes and/or widening pavements for pedestrians by dropping one of the vehicle lanes. Encourage cycling with bike rental and parking facilities as many major cities have done.

W00407

996

i generally support the ERP scheme. in response to the specific questions, i am in agreement with the views as advocated on david webb's article: <https://webb-site.com/articles/erp.asp>

2016-03-12  
15:32:38

W00406

995

I agree with all of the responses to the specific questions articulated by David Webb on his website: <https://webb-site.com/articles/erp.asp>

In particular I do not think there are any privacy concerns related to ERP.

2016-03-12  
15:15:34

W00405

W00404

W00403

W00402

W00401

W00400

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
994	Fully support the proposals made by David Webb on his webb-site.com		2016-03-12 14:55:39
993	I am strongly in favour of ERP introduction and support the submission put in by David Webb (webb-site.com)  Regards  David C. Parker HKID Card Number:		2016-03-12 14:49:40
992	In general I support ERP to help reduce traffic congestion.  ERP could be differential based on types of vehicles and also parts of the ERP zone accessed.  For instance through routes such as Route 4 may be priced lower if they are not left. Charging should be higher if vehicles leave the through routes and enter in to the streets in the ERP zones.  Some vehicles should be exempted such as emergency vehicles and those with a special purpose providing a specific service to the community such disabled transport, special medical transport, animal rescue vehicles should be exempted or have discounted rates. Routine government vehicles should not be exempted.  The issue with ERP is such that it is likely to not deter a sector of the population who are wealthy enough to easily afford the ERP or hire car services who provide chauffer type services. Often these cars driven by professional drivers are the vehicles that contribute most to congestion as they will drop clients off and then park (often double parking) and wait obstructing the roads and blocking lanes.  Many cars contribute to congestion when they wait for access to car parking facilities. Systems similar to those found un Europe should be introduced on major routes and in different areas that identify which car parking facilities have spaces and how many are left. This could be installed alongside any ERP system.  I would also be concerned that ERP may unfairly penalize some residents who live in or near to the ERP zone and as such would need to always pay a charge if they had genuine need of a car but only drove in the ERP to access their home. There may be a way to introduce a system that gave some concession to residents without creating a loophole that residents could abuse and then drive excessively in the ERP.  Similarly - increased development in the congested areas naturally adds to congestions and will continue to even if ERP is introduced as buildings need servicing and more people will be drawn into areas where road design is not suitable. More effort should be put into encouraging pedestrian traffic - making this the preferred method of moving around such areas. Pedestrianised areas should be created, types of vehicles may be restricted in certain areas and at certain times.		2016-03-12 14:40:02
991	不認同需要提高收費,不認為交通常常塞車,因為我都是常常搭地鐵,如有錢我都買車。 大部份香港市民會以mtr, bus 作主要交通工具,一些能賺取更多錢買車的人,或者一些的人士司機,實屬塞車可憐塞車塞過道路是十分正常,利用電子道路收費可以,但不變成加價。 再者請提供電子道路收費所需的儀器費用是多少?是香港人納稅人出錢嗎?		2016-03-12 01:58:35
990	dill f		2016-03-11 16:12:30
989	Dear Sir/Madam,  I don't agree with implementing ERP to Hong Kong (Central). The heart to problem lies in the number of illegal parking in Central. Address that first and also see what the impact of the Central Wanchai by pass has on Central traffic first.  Regards Arthur		2016-03-11 11:00:13



W00399

988	<p>HAS THE GOVERNMENT FULLY CONSIDERED OTHER OPTIONS OF ALLEVIATING TRAFFIC CONGESTION?</p> <p>1) In the public engagement documents on the "Public Engagement" website, Chapter 1, clause 1.4.4 states that "Having considered TAC's recommendations and overseas experience, we agree that an ERP pilot scheme should be pursued to alleviate the road traffic conditions in Hong Kong's central business district – Central and its adjacent areas."</p> <p>How was this decision made to pursue an ERP pilot scheme? Could the Transport and Housing Bureau kindly share with the public the results of whether a complete cost benefit analysis was completed on all 12 proposals by the TAC before concluding that the ERP system was the best solution?</p> <p>2) An ERP system has significant costs in both implementation and maintenance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gantries or detection systems at entry points to the ERP zones</li> <li>Costs of enforcement from both monitoring, identifying violators, ticketing, collection and accounting</li> <li>Costs to motorists to pay for entry into ERP zones</li> <li>Potential costs to motorists or government to purchase any necessary equipment (eg. In vehicle wireless identification modules and/or payment systems)</li> </ol> <p>Are there cheaper methods to increase traffic flow?</p> <p>3) Pushing the congestion from the ERP zones to the fringes of the ERP zones as motorists try to avoid the ERP areas. This would ultimately not solve the overall issue.</p> <p>4) Rather than look trying to reduce demand for usage of the roads, the government should look at increasing the availability of supply of roads</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be clear, this is not to increase the number of roads but to remove blockages</li> <li>Any blockages along the roads removes supply of road and increases congestion</li> <li>Increase in congestion is compounded if vehicles have to change lanes to avoid blockages</li> <li>The "Welcome Message" page on the "Public Engagement" website highlights this perfectly. The image used shows two vehicles (silver Mercedes S-class and delivery truck) blocking the right lane of a 3 lane road. This means that road availability has been reduced by 1/3. With vehicles having to now merge from 3 into 2 lanes, the road availability is effectively reduced by even more than 1/3.</li> <li>The Police are present (police car in left lane and police motorbike in right lane at top of picture) are not doing anything to remove the vehicles blocking the road.</li> </ol> <p>5) Considering all costs to motorists and the government, it would suggest that a far more cost effective option to alleviate traffic congestion would be VERY STRICT enforcement with heavy penalties</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Station traffic wardens on ALL major streets that have heavy traffic during peak periods</li> <li>Traffic wardens are to immediately ticket all vehicles stopping illegally, even if the driver is still in the vehicle (i.e. no waiting by drivers of vehicles)</li> <li>Traffic wardens are to face demerit penalties if they do not strictly and immediately enforce penalties</li> <li>Increase the fines during peak periods by a factor of 50%</li> </ol> <p>These strict measures would force motorists to weigh the costs of trying to illegally stop on roads during peak periods versus the benefits of taking public transport instead. The only additional cost would be increased expenditure by the government to hire more traffic wardens. This cost should be less than the overall costs to both the motoring public and government of implementing and enforcing an ERP system.</p> <p>6) I look forward to the Transport and Housing Bureau disclosing the results of its careful and thorough consideration of costs and benefits of all possible alternatives to implementing an ERP system.</p> <p>7) I encourage the government to publish this suggestion in its entirety for public viewing to encourage additional responses and views from the members of the public.</p>		2016-03-10 14:17:35
987	In the US, toll highways cannot solve traffic congestion effectively. In HK, tunnel fee increases of our Cross Harbour Tunnel does not decrease usage rates. ERP will only add additional logistics and transportation cost to consumers and decrease HK's competitiveness.		2016-03-10 09:09:56
986	Testing E3		2016-03-10 08:33:54
985	test for related information page update!		2016-03-10 08:28:39
984	I believe the charging should be done by licence plate recognition. No charge for electric vehicles. This can be easily monitored by billing based on licence plate.		2016-03-09 20:51:16
983	簡單來說，收費只會對該段道路擠塞的情況有所改善，但汽車數量不會減少，故其附近的道路很有可能會增加，影響其他道路的使用者，問題依然存在。因此，若要解決問題，必要從根本入手，太多汽車的原因是因為有太多人，這是無庸置疑，故要從人口政策著手，才可從源頭解決問題，否則只會是淪為問題轉移而矣，謝		2016-03-09 19:19:16

W00398

W00397

W00396

W00395

W00394

W00393

982

就政府所作《電子道路收費先導計劃》的諮詢，我希冀就以下兩部份提供意見。

（科技）問題 9：短距離微波通訊科技需要每部車輛在進入收費區的安裝車內裝置以繳付電子道路收費；而自動車牌識別科技則需要在車輛每次駛進/駛離收費區或在收費區內道路行駛時拍攝其車牌。整體而言，你認為「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」應較適合採用短距離微波通訊科技，還是自動車牌識別科技？

（收費機制）問題 3：你認為「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」應採用區域為本收費機制，還是周界為本收費機制？原因為何？

政府在「問題 9」選定了自動車牌識別科技（車牌識別）及 RFID 作為選擇。雖然，兩者皆是成熟的技术並有外國的應用例子，但兩者皆是二十年以上的科技，如果香港在 2018 年或以後才實行的系統還是局限於舊有技術，一來顯得政府缺乏遠見，二來亦對香港作為國際城市的形象有負面影響。

事實上，新加坡政府早已定下目標於 2020 年轉用第二代，以 GPS 為基礎的系統，並以於 2016 年 2 月批出工程合約。政府在諮詢文件中亦輕略提及 GPS 的應用，但只是簡單一句技術尚未成熟作結，我們認為這是不全面的，亦未能反映最新的科技發展。

單純依靠人造衛星的定位系統的確會受環境例如高樓影響，但近年已有多種技術補足這方面的缺點，例如：

- 1) Assisted GPS 借助無線電話信號協助定位
- 2) Wi-Fi positioning system 借助 Wi-Fi 信號協助定位
- 3) iBeacon 是 2013 年由蘋果公司公布的一項制式 (Protocol)，利用藍牙技術進行定位，距離可達十米以上。

以上三新技術其一或全部都可以配合 GPS 使用，在樓宇密集的地區（例如中環）達至精準的定位，而 GPS 系統亦可以配合 RFID 系統使用，於進入或離開收費區時作更精準的記錄。1) 及 2) 在中環區尤其充裕，根本無需另行安裝。

的確，現時市面上並未發現現成的產品可以做到混合 RFID、A-GPS、Wi-Fi positioning system、iBeacon 及 GPS 的定位裝置，但我們視此為機會而非阻礙，政府可資助本地的科技企業及大學一起進行研究，如果成功的話，更可將有關產品及經驗輸出到世界其他地方。

引入這個裝置的另一好處，是可以藉此機會在全香港的汽車安裝自動收費裝置，全面淘汰人手收費。香港現有的自動收費系統 Autotoll 乃私人公司營運，使用者需支付月費，以致一直未能全面普及，另一方面，各收費道路仍以人手收費為主，只提供 2-3 條行車線供 Autotoll 使用，導致使用 Autotoll 的汽車很多時比使用人手收費的行車線更慢（尤其是以繁忙時間的東區海底隧道最為嚴重），完全發揮不到自動化的優勢。由政府主導的定位裝置，可分階段強制安裝在全港所有汽車安裝，達至全面自動化，減少駕車之餘亦可方便司機。

事實上，引進自動收費已經是全世界的大勢所趨，例如台灣在 2015 年已經全面自動化所有收費公路，香港再不追上便會顯得落後。

政府在「問題 3」提到，收費機制應採用「區域為本」或「周界為本」。事實上，如果政府能採納以上提議，利用更精準的定位，則收費機制則不必受限於「區域為本」或「周界為本」，政府可以更進一步採用更公平及更有效率的「距離模式」或「時間模式」。

「區域為本」或「周界為本」的問題是對越時間進入收費區的駕駛者不公平，亦製造誘因使駕駛者於付費後更長時間的留在收費區內，對控制車流的目標造成反效果。

「距離模式」或「時間模式」則能更公平地按用者自負的模式收費，並促使駕駛者儘可能將延遲留在收費區的時間。新加坡政府打算於 2020 年轉用的第二代系統同樣是以距離收費。

2016-03-09  
18:40:19

W00392

981	<p>香港中國邊境問題,其實有很多原因,政府在處理邊境問題之前,有否做過調查,到底是什麼原因而做成經常擁擠交通堵塞,當然香港有先天性的地少人多問題,而要解決這問題亦不可用一般只參考或抽離外國的標準做法,而不進一步考慮一否是屬於和適合香港的系統,因為外國的情況未必跟香港一樣。</p> <p>我覺得新的電子收費系統,是必須照顧到每一個利益團體,因為只採用一刀切的辦法,必定會帶至到不公平的現象產生,首先政府必須了解這個塞車的原因,比如現在繁忙時間中,究竟有幾成是綠車,貨車,的士,小巴,大巴,即單車等個人駛區,而當中各類乘客量,和佔用路面多少更廣的情況是必須了解,當收集了數據,經分析和整理後,而建立一套名叫"電子道路收費quota系統"。</p> <p>假設每一個車類經分析後而定立不同指數: 私家車: 8 (可調) 電單車: 6 (可調) 貨車: 5 (可調) 的士: 4 (可調) 小巴: 2 (可調) 大巴: 1 (可調)</p> <p>...</p> <p>首先每一類車輛每3個月(可調)都會更立一個駁回免費使用電子道路收費區域的Quota系數,而該系數餘額是沒有累積,假設Quota系數是12 (可調)以一类私家車為例,該車輛以上述的原則,它可以在指定時間最終免費使用道路次數/天數,則如下: <math>12(\text{系數}) - 8(\text{指數}) = 4 \text{ 次/天}</math> 而該車輛當用畢以上的quota時,則須要支付道路收費系統 而同樣地,一輛巴士使用該區域時,則有11次/天免費使用權,其餘則要付費直至下一次quota 更新時間為止。</p> <p>若果使用以上的系統時,則更有效管控/調節交通流量,更顧及每位不同類型/行業而擁有使用權利益的使用者,在另一個角度看,基本是一個雙贏的措施,因為不會因為收費而增加社會擁擠,在香港這個特別國際都會,我們必須建設一套適合這個地方的系統,而並不是只搬外國的模式和只用單一收費去調節/解決所有問題,最終這制度不是去限制使用者而是協助使用者更有效運用資源。</p> <p>提議人: George Wong 日期: 9/Mar/16 聯絡: Email:</p>	2016-03-09 10:16:22
980	完全不可接受	2016-03-08 17:08:15
979	<p>本人不同意電子道路收費計劃</p> <p>就本人所見(本人於中環上班),交通阻塞大部份成因皆與非法泊車有關。</p>	2016-03-08 11:58:08
978	<p>I disagree with a Central road toll system. It will not serve the purpose of limiting traffic in Central and reducing pollution in Hong Kong.</p> <p>- Some of us use cars to get to Central because we live far away (New Territories) for schools and our work place. We already pay 2 tunnel tolls to get to Central and same to get back home. The burden for us of a supplementary Central toll is very unfair. We can't afford to live on HK Island. We drive a full car everyday; 2 children dropped off to school on HK Island, and 2 adults going to the office in Central. We would face ridiculously long walk + public transport time should we have to give-up driving. The Government does not offer any workable alternative for us.</p> <p>- Most car owners can afford the toll. They will keep on driving into Central, and the toll will only serve to enrich an already very rich Administration.</p> <p>- The Government should NOT have built their brand new offices so near to Central and thus create an even larger traffic problem. Citizens should not have to suffer the Government's lack of planning.</p> <p>-The pollution issue in HK should be dealt with by looking at the most polluting sources first: outdated buses should be replaced (should have been replaced long ago) by green-buses. The ferries should be upgraded to green engines; large cruise boats should not be allowed in the HK bay; the large container ships should be systematically forced to switch to sulfur-free fuels when they enter HK waters.</p> <p>Consider tackling the larger issues before making ordinary citizens and taxpayers' lives miserable.</p> <p>Thank you for taking my views into account.</p>	2016-03-08 04:01:06

W00391

W00390

W00389

W00388

977	<p>致香港特別行政區政府 本人認為塞車原因是</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>巴士道上落客等特是令行車線受影響</li> <li>停客貨車&amp;貨車上落貨令本身只限停客上落客的車線受影響</li> <li>私家車也有在路邊等待令行車線受影響</li> </ol> <p>其實不是電子道路收費便有用，要對症下藥才可以。</p>		2016-03-07 21:38:44
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00387

976	<p>新加坡政府已批出工程開發第二代以 GPS 為本的電子道路收費系統，取代使用了近 20 年的第一代 RFID 系統。 香港政府現在才正進行諮詢，提議於 2018 年在中國使用 RFID 為本的電子道路收費系統。</p> <p>願立令香港成為國際英語，係都諮詢用 GPS，但中環塞車主因為有人將私家車亂泊馬路，罰款抄牌都無用，電子道路收費更只是小量金錢，根本無作用。</p> <p>建議中環 09:00-07:00 私家車禁區，塞車一定可以解決，空氣污染亦隨之見效。</p> <p>無需諮詢，提議於 2018 年在中國使用 RFID 為本的電子道路收費系統，只會浪費納稅人金錢。</p>		2016-03-07 17:27:48
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00386

975	<p>I Don't support this scheme. It is not a good idea and the scheme should be cancelled. We have to drive through Central to get from one district to another, several times a day.</p>		2016-03-06 23:41:20
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00385

974	<p>Q1: The charging area for the pilot scheme should be limited and precise in order to accurately gauge the effectiveness of the scheme.</p> <p>Q2: No, the neighbouring areas should not be included in the pilot scheme due to the reason mentioned in (1) above. It can also provide more useful data on the behaviour of motorists under the pilot scheme, such as the effects on neighbouring areas when motorists choose alternative routes to circumvent the tolled roads.</p> <p>Q3: Cordon-based charging is preferred as it would differentiate between motorists which frequent travel in/out of the tolled area as opposed to the "one-off" users.</p> <p>Q4: The ERP charges should only be implemented during peak hours, to avoid excessive traffic in the neighbouring areas, even during off-peak hours.</p> <p>Q5: Yes, the ERP charges should not be implemented during Sundays and public holidays. With "five-day work weeks" becoming the "norm" in Hong Kong, ERP charges should not be implemented on Saturdays either. In other words, ERP charges should only be implemented during peak hours from Mondays to Fridays, excluding public holidays.</p> <p>Q6: For the pilot scheme, a unified charge would be easier to administer, with less confusion or disagreement. Since private cars appears to be the main target of this scheme, and public transport such as buses are expected to continue to use the toll area, it is suggested that a standard charge would suffice (no need to charge higher or lower amounts for buses).</p> <p>Q7: As explained above, a unified charge is preferred. There are many motorists (especially commercial and public) that will continue to use the toll roads, regardless of the charges. At most, they will just transfer the cost to the public. As such, it is believed that the ERP charges will mainly affect the behaviour of private motorists. A single charge upon entry of the toll area should suffice. Having multiple charging points or using full-day charges may cause unintended havoc to traffic due to motorists diverting their route unnecessarily to avoid extra toll, or using toll area unnecessarily if they are charged on a per-day basis.</p> <p>Q8: For the pilot scheme, suggest no further exemption or concession beyond emergency vehicles. No good reason why other non-emergency vehicles should be treated differently on the roads.</p> <p>Q9: A large proportion of cars already have "auto-toll" tags, which has proved to be convenient and efficient. It is the initial and continuing cost which prevents the rest of the motorists from using it as well.</p> <p>The Octopus Card is a good and successful example in Hong Kong. Rather than introduce yet another new system, suggest to find ways to make "auto-toll" tags affordable / accessible for all motorists. This will then allow much easier implementation of the ERP charging system.</p> <p>Q10: If use existing technology/mechanism such as the "Auto-toll" tags mentioned in (9) above, there should not be additional privacy concerns, since "Auto-toll" tags have already been in use in Hong Kong for more than a decade.</p> <p>Q11: The existing car count and average travel time are good indicators. Air pollution levels measured in the Central level may also be a good supporting indicator.</p> <p>Q12: ERP charge is only one of the mechanisms that can be used to alleviate traffic congestion in the CBD. As such, the fee level alone should not be reviewed regularly. Depending on the effectiveness of the scheme, should review and consider the full range of measures that can be used.</p> <p>Q13: As a motorist myself, I would find it helpful if there is a timely and accurate "warning" system which would alert me on the traffic conditions (i.e. areas with traffic congestion / traffic accidents) so I could avoid taking those routes.</p> <p>Rather than just focusing on monetary charging levels, which cannot, by itself resolve the problem, suggest to explore the design and implementation of a timely and accurate system to alert motorists on traffic conditions. A similar system is currently used to alert motorists on the traffic conditions of the cross-harbour tunnels (as well as other major routes). Similar warning panels can be used to alert/inform motorists of the traffic conditions in the CBD. A mobile app can also be a cost effective and efficient way to keep motorists informed.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>		2016-03-06 13:43:34
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00384

973 I do not support ERP to be implemented at anywhere in Hong Kong.

I do not think putting a "tax" will help improve the traffic congestion situations in Hong Kong, especially in Central where a lot of rich businessmen's cars will still get in no matter how much the ERP is. Implementing ERP is actually giving convenience to rich people at the expense of those who really need to use the roads.

The Police should ask the drivers to pull off rather than allowing them to wait for their bosses at busy spots.

2016-03-08 00:55:16

W00383

972 寄件人要求把身份保密，請保護寄件人私人，謝謝。

為香港電子道路收費系統提供意見：

本人和丈夫居住於港島北角，每天駕車往中環上班，雖然暫時不知道中環那些道路將會納入電子收費範圍，但本人覺得此方法不能完全解決塞車問題，反而對某些商業者造成不公平現象。

中環一向是商業及金融中心，工作人口一直比較多；近十年填海建成的商業大廈、新的政府辦公大樓、酒店改建成的商廈等等，都造成工作人口不斷膨脹，人口的增加，造就區內新的食肆及其他有關的服務業進駐，新的食肆及服務業又帶動新的工作人口，亦可能會間，不斷增加的人口，可以利用公共交通工具上班，沒錯！大部份工作人口都已經使用公共交通工具，例如地鐵或公共巴士，所以中環線在繁忙時間已經擠得水不通，有時甚至要等下一班才可以上車；而巴士往中環的供線往往要大排長龍，巴士經常因客滿而要飛站，而的士則，在繁忙時間更會出現不少人在不同的路口攔截的士，搶過你死我活，雖然說你死我活是有點誇張，但當你每天都要應付這種情景，實在會令人很氣結。

本人就是由年初10年飛港港線，但感覺越來越擁擠，改為飛搭巴士，但因大排長龍及客滿而難準上班時間，經過8年的巴士生涯，最後改為飛搭的士，但往往駕車很久才到公司，思前想後，最後我和丈夫決定開車上班，可以省下時間來投入工作。

其實，把經濟的重心放於中環是以前政府和現任政府一路把城市規劃地劃下來的結果，我們這些中產人士在稅務方面已經沒有什麼優惠，現在還要加緊我們中產人士的負擔，而增加收費對於那些老闆來說卻沒有任何阻礙作用。

另一方面，許多堵塞的情況是由於巴士過多而造成，巴士體積龐大，數量多，每每又要排隊到站上落客，這些都會阻礙路面，問題是巴士載客量亦有多有少，這是否反映巴士路線並未能有效管理，造成巴士數量膨脹，對巴士公司來說，巴士數量越多，就能增加Capex，對其票價的調整有幫助，但造成堵塞後的費用要轉嫁給其他路面使用者，就顯得不公平，同時，每早上班時間都會發現不少調配的渣巴士，這些巴士都是沒有載客，調配的巴士亦會對路面造成負擔，在早上繁忙時間，益不多每一分鐘都會發現有幾款調配的、不載人的巴士使用中環路面，我在早上曾經試過一次，看到六至七輛沒載客的調配巴士在中環同一時間在同一馬路上排隊行駛；也經常看到十多廿輛載客巴士排隊上落客，政府必須正視巴士路線的重視，及其是否導致路線有效管理，現在big data的運用已經很成熟，巴士公司不難找出那些路線是可以合併，那些快線可以加多班次等等。

最後，增加道路網才是政府必須落實的工作，而不是把本應要改善的問題推向市民，中環停車場月費已經不菲，還要增加道路使用費，實在大層增加中產人士的負擔；對於老闆而言並沒有什麼阻礙作用，最後可能令老闆車轉插無區，還可以自由停泊，對於在中環工作的我，被徵收道路使用費實在覺得非常不公平。

對於在中環工作，而又有月費停車場的駕駛人士，不願徵收道路使用費用。

2016-03-04 23:24:56

W00382

971 電子道路收費先導計劃不應該推行，應該先等灣仔by-pass 完成及西區回收後的實際道路情況再作出檢討才作出下步計劃。

2016-03-04 14:53:54

W00381

970 ERP Pilot Scheme in Central should not be conducted till the impact of Wan Chai by-pass truly reflect the actual traffic situation in Central.

2016-03-04 14:49:32

W00380

969 中環的交通實在太塞綫，尤其高層們經常大模大樣將私家車停在路邊，收費以限制汽車進入，我支持收費。

2016-03-04 13:06:07

W00379

968 本人覺得無可能，因為這會計劃根本就原此薄彼，如果可以豁免巴士，或租用車輛，屆時地稅又會加價，巴士會加價難道有車的人就要付上更多費用嗎？

人有稱要先會經過此地，難道外國有此計劃真的沒有塞車嗎？如果這個方法是有效，那會出現塞車嗎？如果公私管理車輛都要收費，我無話可說，但如果只有私用車輛收費，請告知我，這是公平嗎？

2016-03-04 11:17:22

W00378

967 TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I object the suggestion of ERP.

To solve this problem, more officers patrol in the street to prevent vehicle parking for a long time in Central. In the main road to solve congestion, there need more officers conduct the road which make the flow of traffic smoothly.

Yours sincerely,  
Mr Sung

2016-03-04 10:39:30

W00377

966	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I would like to see an acknowledgement that a major benefit of ERP should be reduced roadside pollution and therefore concessions or exemptions should be provided to environmentally friendly vehicles, using existing tests eg for waiver of FRT.</p> <p>There are other towns in HK no less congested than Central that might benefit from ERP.</p> <p>A further thought is to regulate traffic flow through the cross harbour tunnels through a co-ordinated (and effectively communicated) variable pricing mechanism, encouraging drivers to divert from contested tunnel/s to preferred crossing route/s. This may require a complex merger of the 3 tunnels but should be worth considering.</p> <p>I would like to see something said of the "Use of Proceeds" - initially to repay investment in (and management, build out of) ERP. How will any surplus funds be deployed?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>		2016-03-04 08:13:39
965	<p>1. Long overdue. 2. Make it as simple as possible to begin with. Install hardware quickly, maybe after a short pilot scheme. 3. Modifications and additions (e.g. differentiated charge schemes) can easily be done via software if and when necessary.</p>		2016-03-03 12:25:49
964	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I think an ERP system is a great idea, however the most important thing is to set the charging level at an extremely high rate.</p> <p>In my opinion, the ERP should be set at at least \$300 per day so people will be compelled to use modes of transport other than private cars to get to the Central district.</p> <p>Thank you</p>		2016-03-03 10:54:30
963	<p>1.You have made your questionnaire too complicated and this will discourage many people from responding</p> <p>2. The survey should have been basically a simple "Yes" or "No" to the concept of using congestion charges to reduce traffic in busy down-town areas.</p> <p>3. I am IN FAVOUR of congestion charges being applied around the clock in all west Kowloon and north Hong Kong Island streets.</p> <p>4.The privacy issue should be disregarded because the recording of a vehicle's presence in any location is not legal proof that any particular person is driving it.</p> <p>5.If an offence has been committed by the driver of a motor vehicle, the police have the power to demand the identity of the driver from the owner of the vehicle but this would only occur for a very specific set of circumstances relating to the commission of offences and when public interest justifies that the owner of a vehicle should supply details of the driver. This is not an unjustified invasion of privacy.</p>		2016-03-03 10:23:36
962	<p>繁忙時間私家車進入指定區域收費，包括官方車輛。</p>		2016-03-03 08:06:37
961	<p>本人建議在上環至銅鑼灣拖車電子道路收費計劃在中環灣仔繞道通車之後才實行。</p>		2016-03-02 21:58:48

W00376

W00375

W00374

W00373

W00372

W00371

960	<p>Q1 and Q2: The scheme should cover the core area of Central and Sheung Wan only. Admiralty should not be included as it is the major junction between the east and west connection. Must also exclude access to the HK Airport Express station. And most important, roads like Caine Road, Garden Road and Red Cotton Road must be excluded from the scheme as these are the major direct access from Mid-Levels to other areas of Hong Kong.</p> <p>Q4: The ERP should be imposed during the business hours only, such as from 8:30am to 6:30pm.</p> <p>Q5: The charging period should exclude from Saturday 2pm to Monday 8:30am and public holidays. These are period that the traffic in Central are not heavy.</p> <p>Q8: It should be differential charges based on vehicle sizes. Larger vehicles to be charged more.</p> <p>Q9: Prefer DSRC.</p>		2016-03-02 10:43:39
959	<p>There should be charges in all inner roads in the central area . HK has great public transport and abundance of taxis and no reason why people are still driving in. So they should be charged for creating the congestion and polluting the air.</p>		2016-03-01 20:27:24
958	<p>Forget the ERP, align all the cross harbour tunnel fee's so traffic can be more even spread out and stop the conjection from Central to Causeway Bay.</p> <p>Surely a fair pricing mechanism can be arranged so that each company gets their fair share.</p> <p>Was the Western Harbour Tunner built just for the rich and everyone else has to suffer by getting stuck in horrendous traffic on Gloucester Road!</p> <p>The same principle applies to the Kowloon side and traffic in Tsim Sha Tsui and Ho Man Tin (even up to Mong Kok) can be diverted to the other less used tunnels.</p>		2016-03-01 19:55:01
957	<p>I Do Not agree to electronic road pricing in Central. It is an unfair charge to drivers who have been driving in and out of Central several times a day as we live in the area.</p>		2016-03-01 18:50:46
956	<p>問題 1 你對於劃設「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費區有何意見？原因為何？ 答案：反對/ 原因是中區那麼小還要劃分電子道路收費，政府年年通脹水漲，沒有適當於民，樓價升不停，小市民生活已經辛苦.....</p>		2016-02-29 23:13:16
955	<p>I believe that total road pricing for all vehicles is not acceptable. For the intents and purposes of the scheme and for the best results, all goods vehicles, heavy lorries and especially container type lorry vehicles should definitely be charged as these vehicles belong to companies and should be charged since they are out there to earn money for the companies involved. Further,mtaxis and buses should be charged as well as they traverse the roads constantly clogging up the roads, not the few private cars that utilise those roads.</p> <p>George Salamon</p>		2016-02-29 12:41:36
954	<p>I believe that total road pricing for all vehicles is not acceptable. For the intents and purposes of the scheme and for the best results, all goods vehicles, heavy lorries and especially container type lorry vehicles should definitely be charged as these vehicles belong to companies and should be charged since they are out there to earn money for the companies involved. Further,mtaxis and buses should be charged as well as they traverse the roads constantly clogging up the roads, not the few private cars that utilise those roads.</p> <p>George Salamon</p>		2016-02-29 12:41:29

W00370

W00369

W00368

W00367

W00366

W00365

W00364

953	<p>致理幹事，</p> <p>感謝 貴署邀請原音，有公眾參與的平台。首先本人是沒有私家車的香港居民，往往是乘坐港鐵由新界出港島區上班或見朋友等等，一般都選擇地面交通工具(巴士、的士、小巴)，這些交通車輛一經到上環區路線，往往都難以估計其所需時間，曾西上環、中環、金鐘、灣仔、銅鑼灣、天后、北角，都是一堆車交通擠擁的地區。</p> <p>假如我們身為市民可以為香港的未來發展有個更藍天的中環地區，能否設立類似大嶼山區、馬灣的柏樹灣區那樣，當中只行使公共電車的、的士等，一般的私人車輛、私人車輛都需要限制出人的時間和數量呢？如果多設置免費停車場在中環地區外圍，又可以鼓勵車主願意放下自己的愛車，幫助整個城市發展更有國際旅遊城市的風範，豈不是多方受益了嗎？</p> <p>多方受益的解釋就是：本地市民可以重新選擇公共車輛一種車穿梭整個香港，中環地區減少車輛擠塞，空氣地比較清新，比較容易看得到藍天，旅客也會享受到有規劃的市區，欣賞市民(私車主們)的合作和付出，多留香港演費，吸引更多商機，更樂意與香港人投資在本地，促進就業和經濟上升。</p> <p>本地小市民12</p>		2016-02-27 20:39:04
952	I totally disagree this proposal. It is toally a big burden to the HK ciizen. I do not think the traffic jam is that bad as other countries.		2016-02-26 23:34:31
951	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I write this letter to express my humble opinion regarding the captioned scheme. In principle, I object the scheme and do not consider this will resolve the traffic issue in Hong Kong in long term or at all.</p> <p>The main cause to the traffic jamming in Hong Kong is simply because there are too many cars in Hong Kong. Even if the scheme came into play, it only targets the problem in central district, that only forces drivers who are unwilling to pay for the charge to crowd outside central district, this would lead to deadlocks in neighbour areas, namely Wan Chai, Admiralty, Sheung Wan, or even Kennedy Town. In particular, the scheme would inevitably lead to crowding cars in Wan Chai, it would then lead to even more severe traffic jammings in Causeway Bay, which I believe is another big issue that the government is trying hard to resolve in the meanwhile.</p> <p>In order to resolve the increasing numbers of cars in Hong Kong, hereinbelow are the more practical proposals:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. those who lives in public housing in Hong Kong, shall not be entitled per se to own any vehicles. It is utmost absurd that many people living in public housing in Hong Kong actually own cars. They often complain insufficient supply of car park spaces. In light of them being financially supported by the government, why would they have extra money to own, run, maintain vehicles as luxury products? Those who own cars but living in public housing shall be subject to a re-evaluation as to their financial status.</li> <li>2. cars that are aged 10 years or more shall be subject to higher annual vehicle charge. Old cars in general creates more pollution than newer ones due to mechanical reasons. The government simply raising the VAT will not resolve the problem long term. Purchasing a car is a trivial costs compares to the long term maintenance expenses. Many people in Hong Kong are willing to purchases these 10 year-old car, just for the sake of owning a car, in which many of these people live in public housing.</li> </ol>		2016-02-26 18:40:32
950	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 本人認為所收的費用應該用以改善該收路段之路面不平之情況以及其設備。取之於民,用之於民。</li> <li>2. 收費只為改善道路交通流量,應該劃一收費,如果不同收費,目的是否為改善交通流量或是另市民加重負擔?!</li> <li>3. 如果使用安裝電子設備收費,該設備之保險保養問題應該由政府負責,因為收費不是市民提出,收費方式也是政府要求,安裝設備,由申請安裝至更換之問題及收費應該交由問題發出者負責,即香港政府。</li> </ol>		2016-02-26 12:37:59
949	Simply levying a price on usage of road cannot solve congestion in Central District. The money gained from ERP should be used for improving efficient of roads inside the area. New technology like intelligent system for parking should be employed. Road usage outside daytime period should be encouraged as mean to segregate daytime heavy traffic.		2016-02-25 11:59:23
948	this means that rich people can use and not for poorer ones. this is not fair!		2016-02-25 10:03:40

W00363

W00362

W00361

W00360

W00359



W00358

947	<p>ERP has less to do with traffic management, and more to do with revenue generation. People who can afford cars in HK, can afford to pay the congestion charges, so it will make little difference to traffic in Central.</p> <p>Rather than looking to ERP to reduce traffic in Central, why not explore better traffic policing to achieve the same result? If all the cars (including Government cars) that are waiting illegally, or double and triple parked on Glen ealy, Ioe House Street, Chater Road, Queen's Road Central, Wellington Street, Lyndhurst Terrace etc. were moved, traffic flow would be much smoother.</p> <p>Attempt a simple solution before getting bogged down in a complicated one.</p> <p>Thank You</p>		2016-02-24 11:25:53
946	<p>對該區住的居民應該有豁免，如每次首次來回不用收費</p>		2016-02-23 23:43:58
945	<p>只可說是多餘!有考慮過不付費的區域可能付嗎?中環這地區原因我相信主要是海墾填海的影響，為何不待中環填海及回收東區後才研究ERP呢?另外巴士過多同時擠塞中環、灣仔、金鐘也是事實主因，何不考慮巴士轉乘或合併路線呢?</p>		2016-02-23 13:34:11

W00357

W00356

W00355

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
944	<p>收費機制應該以簡易為本, 每次進入收費區域收基本費用, 但同時可加上時間收費, 在離開區域設置感應器, 每小時以變通方式收取費用, 減少車輛在區內停留, 如以定額收費, 對老細志在區內停留等候的問題作用不大, 此外該老細減少, 應該收取更高費用。</p> <p>收費時間方面, 只需在繁忙時段收費, 讓貨客可安排在不繁忙時間進入該區上落貨物。</p> <p>公共交通工具(如巴士, 小巴)應該提供折扣, 收費只會令巴士公司加價, 另可對的士提供優惠, 如只收基本費用。</p> <p>科技方面, 可用遠距離微波通訊科技, 如車輛未能成功繳費, 可以以其他方法在三日內支付, 否則再發出告票, 此方法避免紀錄所有車牌。</p>		2016-02-22 14:11:38
943	<p>i am against ERP. every day i drive from Lam Tin to Central (Exchange Square) during peak hours in the morning and it seldom takes me more than 30 mins. i don't consider that to be too congested. On the other hand if i try to take the MTR or buses, they are so jammed that the journey is totally a torture. An ERP system that drives more people to MTR and buses is not to the benefit of the majority of the public. It is entirely unnecessary and could be counter-productive.</p>		2016-02-22 10:47:28
942	<p>in order to reduce traffic jam in central. Government can set up CCTV (together with appropriate software) to detect illegal parking and waiting and mail penalty ticket to car owner. Benefit of CCTV - 1) no need to increase traffic controllers, 2) no need to waste time on talking to driver, 3) can give out more tickets if driver blocking the road for longer period.</p>		2016-02-21 18:07:35
941	<p>my suggestions are as follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) do a survey and find out how many cars will stop driving to central after the implementation of ERP, and which kind?</li> <li>2) I notice many empty buses or with carrying very few passengers are driving on the road, please do a survey and find out what is the optimal capacity.</li> <li>3) fine those buses which stop at the stop bus and at the same time occupy more than ONE lane.</li> <li>4) impose progressive penalty charges for illegal parking and waiting. Especially for those cars waiting big bosses after office hours. example, first penalty cost 380, second penalty within 1 year 760, third penalty within 1 year 1,520.....</li> <li>5) exempt ERP for those private cars which have designated car park in central. So that driver can wait in the car park instead of blocking roads.</li> </ol>		2016-02-20 22:18:55
940	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>The government should observe real life situation and not rely only on data. Yes there are too many cars in busy districts but as shown in a TVB program, the vehicles that cause the most traffic jam are the ones that stop on the side of roads waiting for their bosses. They often stay in waiting zones (and very often stop even in a regular lane) for a long time, forcing other cars to stop in the regular lanes to alight passengers. These cars then cause traffic jams and so on.</p> <p>Take myself as an example. I am a considerate driver. Yes I drive to Central for work on a daily basis but I always park in parking lots and rarely stop on the road. Therefore, I am on the road for just a very short time.</p> <p>Toll is not effective for reducing traffic jam because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the vehicles making prolonged stops are mainly owned by wealthy people so monetary penalty has extremely little impact</li> <li>- these drivers even if they don't stop for waiting, they tend to circle around the busiest streets causing unnecessary traffic flows</li> <li>- toll is not fair to cars just passing by the district or entering the district but stay in parking lots (very little contribution to traffic jams)</li> </ul> <p>More effective ways are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impose more all day no stopping zones in the busiest areas such as the front of IFC mall in Central</li> <li>- Install cameras to record evidence on cars that violate no stopping zones or repeatedly appearing in busiest areas</li> <li>- Negative scores be given to both the driver and car owner (if different persons) for violation. The scores should be recorded permanently on the driver's license record. Repeated offense should be penalised with denial of driver license renewal and/or revocation.</li> </ul> <p>As a conclusion, I strongly believe that financial penalty is not an effective way to solving the congestion problem. Effective measures (as suggested above) must be linked to the driver's behavior and be personally liable for violations.</p> <p>Thanks. J</p>		2016-02-20 17:18:50

W00351

W00350

939	<p>就電子道路收費計劃，意見如下：</p> <p>1. 邊址問題 在文件中指出道路擠塞問題在打打路及渣打道尤其嚴重只是比人行快一點，為何不在上述地點試行，而是在中環一帶呢？</p> <p>2. 收費車輛種類 本人認為除了公共交通工具及緊急車輛，其他均需收費</p> <p>3. 收費水平 私家車每次收費遠比公共車輛的貴多，例如網羅至中海地鐵成人收費是5.7元，私家車行經此路收 5.7元 X 4人 (私家車的客量) X3倍 = 68.4元 才令人有放棄駕車</p>		2016-02-19 15:58:50
938	<p>I am against the ERP as there are many cars who bstruct the traffic are driven by chauffeur who are waiting and circling to wait for their employer. Besides most of the taxi driver who are routinely ignore the no stopping zone (even the 12 to 12 and double yellow line) due to discretion ticketing of the police and traffic warden.</p> <p>It would be better if the taxi were taken away their permit to stop on certain restricted zone which would ease a lot of traffic jam and improve the traffic flow in a lot of area.</p> <p>Also extend the no stopping zone and strictly enforce traffic law offence against all offender is way better then impose the ERP.</p> <p>I am against the ERP and it won't improve the traffic flow if it is set lower then HKD200.</p> <p>It is also not fair to other road users who only pass central occassionally and while the taxi and cars with chauffeur can enjoy easier traffic but they are infact the culprit who causing traffic jam.</p>		2016-02-19 15:43:39

W00349

W00348

<p>Hi Officer,</p> <p>I would like to bring to your attention that the basis for ERP Pilot Scheme is significantly flawed.</p> <p>While the system is designed to incur a higher cost for those who drive to certain areas, for example in this case Central, the system would merely cause drivers to utilize other roads instead. The scheme would simply divert traffic into other areas and thus increase load on to other roads. If anything, traffic jams in Central are no worse than other parts of the city.</p> <p>The biggest problem in Hong Kong traffic isn't about Central traffic jams, and it's actually much bigger fundamental problem that the Hong Kong government has refused to fixed. This ERP Pilot Scheme is just trying to generate revenue without resolving the problem (and increasing the problem in elsewhere). I will list the items that would need to be resolved with much higher priority before implementing the ERP Pilot Scheme:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hong Kong has a very severe problem with excess number of buses on the road. A number of bus routes have very frequent buses that are generally empty. The amount of redundant buses on the main roads in Hong Kong are causing major traffic jams as they go in and out of the stops. The Hong Kong government has always ignored this problem and put the blame on private cars on the road. Reducing the excess capacity on buses alone would help resolve the major traffic jams in Hong Kong.</li> <li>2. Lack of parking lots. Newer commercial and residential buildings do not have adequate parking lots. This creates the issue that drivers need to circulate around the block while waiting to pick up a passenger. Or in some cases, forces the drivers to park illegally on the street. These are cars that do not necessarily need to occupy the road if there are adequate parking provided.</li> <li>3. The autotoll system is needs to be FREE. The Autotoll system is poorly implemented. Drivers need to pay a fee of 35 HKD or so a month. If the Hong Kong government or Transport Department genuinely cares about the traffic jams near tunnel areas, then the HK Government needs to seriously consider offering the AutoToll as a free service to the drivers by waiving the administrative fee. On top of that, there should be more lanes allocated to AutoToll. I'm a driver in Hong Kong myself, and I find it unreasonable that I would need to pay a fee every month to go through fewer lanes in most tunnels. There are often a longer line at the tunnel area on the AutoToll lane. This should not be the case. The amount of wear and tear caused on the cars (tires/brakes) + road pavement and the relevant pollution are significant once you add up all the incremental impact. If the HK Government truly wants to observe examples from other countries, then look at the US. US has a system called EZPass, where drivers are offered EZPass for free of admin charges. On top of that, drivers are encouraged to use EZPass as toll fees are discounted if driver uses electronic payment systems, as the EZpass reduces the pollution and wear/tear on the road significantly in the long run. It also speeds up the process as drivers and toll booth workers no longer need to sort out the change. Last but not the least, US keeps only limited number of lanes available for cash transactions and open up all lanes for EZPass. If Hong Kong government is serious about reducing pollution and traffic jams, please stop incurring admin fees and actually provide incentive for electronic payments.</li> <li>4. Law enforcements on inappropriate driving habits. This is ***NOT*** referring to speeding. HK Government/Police Department spends far too much effort on upgrading their speed cameras and distributing speeding tickets. However, zero efforts have been given on the real problem: attitudes and habits of drivers. Many accidents are caused by drivers running redlights, abrupt lane changes, changing lanes in last minute/solid lines, following others too closely, not turning on headlights at night, etc. Yet the message sent to the public is that speeding is bad. Sure, speeding at 50km/h over limit will cause dangers to other road users. However, the current system is so focused on someone driving @ 91km/h in a 80km/h zone on a sunny day on a straight road. This all goes to show to me that the government is just looking at increasing revenue without actually caring about the safety of road users. To begin with, this doesn't stop the reckless drivers and only creates more traffic jam and increases travel times for normal drivers. Besides, far too many cameras are setup at areas that are in speed zone change or just at the point of the hill when cars could easily exceed speed limit without causing real dangers. However, that's where the police and Government is targeting. Please go catch the drivers with bad habits who follow others too closely and stop blaming the regular drivers who are genuinely missing the speed limit in an area that actually poses no real dangers on a small gap above the speed limit.</li> </ol> <p>The ERP Pilot Scheme has been pointing out how similar schemes have been implemented in other countries, but also fails to acknowledge that it's a failure in other countries. Take Singapore for example, their ERP scheme has failed as that ends up putting stress into other parts of the city. Again and again, the real solutions to traffic jams require the government to look at other areas. Simply collecting money from the road users like that is just another revenue generating scheme that does not help the public.</p> <p>Drivers should be charged based on usage rather than ownership as well. The talks of increasing vehicle first registration tax (FRT) or annual licensing fees achieve absolutely nothing. The goal is to reduce usage, and not ownership of cars. Higher taxes on fuel/gasoline is a good place to start. You would want people to drive their car less and plan their routes appropriately, so that people don't wander around the block while waiting to pick up a passenger.</p> <p>That said, reducing redundant buses, increasing parking spaces, promoting Autotoll, and penalizing inappropriate drivers should be top priorities. However, I see the government doing none of the above and merely focusing on generating revenue. Please consider my comments carefully.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>		<p>2016-02-19 13:58:58</p>
<p>036</p>	<p>香港是一個繁榮的地方，雖然可說是科技發達，但實際上並不是，很多事是很多動及政府部門之間會用各種理由而推說都工作就是另一個部門，不是想為香港好而做，所以我非常贊同參考外國的電子道路收費，做好一個真正的繁榮的香港</p>	<p>2016-02-19 09:30:17</p>

W00347

W00346

935	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>My name is Mr. Wong &amp; live in HK Island side. Recap to ERP Pilot Scheme in Central, I was rejected &amp; not recommended process this Scheme which is no useful to avoid the traffic impact during rush hour in Central. The only way considering should buy back the Western Tunnel as well as review/reduce duplicated bus circulation in priority.</p> <p>Pls consider upon my opinion &amp; help you re-consider this point beforehand.</p> <p>Thank your for your attention.</p> <p>Mr. Wong</p>		2016-02-18 17:07:32
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00345

934	<p>The government should cancel the taxi's permit to drop off and pick up passenger in restricted area and start issue ticket against all road user who stop illegally. It is the taxis that stop along queen's road even in double yellow line and the car with chauffeur who are waiting for their employers that cause the traffic jams.</p> <p>It is no use to implement any ERP to the taxi and chauffeur driven cars. They would just remain in the charged area so that they do not have to pay again which would worsen the problems.</p> <p>Allocate 50 more traffic warden along central area during 8 am to 8 pm and let them ticket anyone would be much more effective.</p>		2016-02-18 02:11:33
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00344

933	<p>It's not fair to residence living around the region. They have to bare the cost.</p>		2016-02-17 21:22:26
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00343

932	<p>道路收費，令公共交通工具營運成本上升，難免把收費轉嫁至市民身上。繁忙時段，在中環及附近經濟地段，一班市民在該地區工作在必須使用道路的情況底下，收費並不會令道路減少車輛，亦強行徵收費用，變相令市民百上加斤，特別對低收入人士帶來更沉重負擔。</p>		2016-02-17 20:28:50
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00342

931	<p>你好，</p> <p>本人是僱傭人士車輛之駕駛者，因工作及身體狀況弱需需要往中環及九龍作上班用途，因政府提倡僱傭人士接納更多社會，故希望 貴局能將僱傭人士車輛及用作接納僱傭人士之車輛作豁免。</p> <p>李先生</p>		2016-02-17 18:54:33
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00341

930	<p>Owners of Car Parks within the Central District should be excluded otherwise they would then have to pay for access to park in their property (Car Park). If a charge is to be levied then a rebate should be considered up to a certain amount or entries.</p> <p>AB NASIR</p>		2016-02-17 15:58:04
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00340

929	<p>用道路收費來控制車流根本係本末倒置，不但不是長遠的解決方法，而是短視和令香港交通倒退，對於用公司名義的車輛來說就更是九牛一毛，反而影響了真正有需要的市民。</p> <p>與其浪費時間金錢在收費安排上，不如建設一些基本設施，如行車天橋、繞道等等。</p> <p>三條過海隧道今天還夠用？車輛隨著人口增加而增加，第四條過海隧道有計劃了嗎？</p> <p>紅磡還有必要用紅綠燈來令交通更堵塞？還是在尖沙咀(環大側)北行往紅磡方向紅綠燈合理一點？</p>		2016-02-17 14:27:39
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00339

928	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>If I may share a few comments:</p> <p>Charging Area: Similar to Singapore, charging should only apply to very select streets and portions thereof, instead of applying to the whole of Central. For instance on Queen's Road Central, vehicles driving from Wanchai to Cheung Kong Center (and leaving through the Citibank Plaza exit to Cotton Tree Drive/ Garden Road back up to Midlevels) are not a cause of traffic c ongestions in Central, but instead only those vehicles which continue driving further down on Queen's Road towards Landmark. It would not seem very fair to charge those drivers who do not effectively contribute to the cong estions.</p> <p>Charging Time: As a daily commuter for work on weekdays, I find that traffic before 9am is overall moderate, while it becomes very congested mostly during lunch hours (when there seem to be most delivery trucks at the sh ops alongside Queen's Road Central which use up a driving lane severely impacting traffic flows).</p> <p>Many thanks!</p>		2016-02-16 10:05:25
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00338

927	I strongly support the implementation of electronic road pricing in central to alleviate congestion. Any environmental measures which may reward low or zero emissions vehicles would be welcome.		2016-02-15 21:38:18
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00337

926	Commenter wants to keep the comment unpublished 意見人不願公開意見		2016-02-15 15:34:53
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00336

925	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Personally I don't think HK gov should apply ERP this yet. Since the block of traffic for example in central is due to the illegal parking. In fact for the whole HK illegal parking is quite serious. Of course this in fact is because H K has too little parking space. So in fact, I think what HK gov should increase parking space (it will be parked by a car illegally anyway, so why don't HK gov change some of them to legal parking and charge them) and increa se the charge for parking and the penalty for the illegal parking. And more importantly should enforce it in area like central more often, so that 1st step is to eliminate those illegal parking. Otherwise ERP will just block the gen eral public but not the illegal parking, even though there will be less car going through central, the blocking or traffic will not be reduced a lot. Please reconsider what is the purpose of ERP before applying it. Unless you simpl y want a road full of parking cars but not many people using it and consider that as reduced the traffic.</p>		2016-02-14 17:04:33
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00335

924	反對		2016-02-14 16:51:06
-----	----	--	------------------------

W00334

923	<p>政府應該實施erp，係peak hour and school zone時間就要收取比其他時間更多錢toll 令到可以改善中環交通堵塞情況同時鼓勵市民乘搭公共交通工具 又可以改善中環空氣情況 同時我覺得可以檢查轉數00分鐘唔同既收費 大00既意比得較多錢toll 而比較少00既意比少d 加強警方係附近執法 立即檢控違例泊車 政府亦應提升違例泊車罰款 應由現在320加到640 可以立即改善交通違例問題 以杜絕違例問題 加強公文教育 社區宣傳 學校教育</p>		2016-02-14 11:37:36
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00333

922	<p>為什麼教育局局長吳克儉提出要刪除「公義在社會的重要性」呢？他自己認為「公義」不重要就事啦！還要教育下一代要他們覺得「公義」不重要！ 這個教育局局長是什麼樣的一個教育局局長？他配合做這個職位嗎？收了納稅人每月XX萬薪金，卻教人子女「公義」在社會不重要？聽聞他每月至少閱讀30本書，原來到頭來，他所學得的知識是「公義在社會不重要」！我好驚訝及懷疑他看的是什麼書.....居然可以覺得公義不重要！ 我還政府請他做教育局局長了！做什麼教育呢？據公義這麼重要的東西，他卻覺得不重要！怪不得他給人鄙視了！也給人了解到他的行為原來是沒公義可言的！明白了！我真的明白了！</p>		2016-02-14 00:02:49
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00332

921	<p>電子道路收費政策相對富有車主 不能解決中區交通擁塞 並會加緊社會貧富對立 撕裂社會和諧</p> <p>(1) 嚴重擁堵引致傳聞 導致交通阻塞</p> <p>有駕車到中環的人士都見到不少車輛(多數為私家車及貨車)，擁堵在路旁，令數條行車線或二線行車，轉而引導到交通長期嚴重擁塞，道路收費並不會阻止該種情況。</p> <p>(2) 道路收費政策相對富有車主 加緊社會貧富對立 撕裂社會和諧</p> <p>大眾從不少報導知道，富人車輛經常擁堵中區，因富有而不懼罰款抄牌，道路收費並不能阻止該類富人車輛擁堵中區，交通擁塞依然。</p> <p>而且富人車輛因富有而能無限繳出道路收費區，而並不富有的車主便不能無限繳出這屬於不分階級的公眾擁堵的中區，因此道路收費政策對富有車主，亦似不能阻止富人車輛經常擁堵中區，則不必關心中區貧富對立心態及考慮。</p> <p>(3) 道路收費引致車主不能方便使用公眾的道路</p> <p>佔中期間中區主道路被佔，車輛不能從上環或灣仔駛到中區到另一邊，嚴重影響交通，車輛繞道到上環以西或灣仔以東地區，中國道路收費制度成為中國被佔，令該以收費區為目的地而又不欲繳費穿過中區的車主嚴重不便。</p> <p>(4) 道路收費引致增設收費區的道路擁塞</p> <p>車輛可憐不欲繳費穿過收費區，便被迫使用環繞收費區的道路，引致這些外圍小枝路不必要的嚴重影響居民生活。</p> <p>(5) 道路收費區變成富人區</p> <p>在收費區的小商戶小產戶為避免因道路收費而增加成本，被迫離開收費區，讓富有商家獨佔這屬於區廣大市民的收費區，貧富對立嚴重。</p> <p>(6) 正本根源上策：徹底阻止擁堵中收費區的嚴重擁堵</p> <p>以徹底阻止擁堵中收費區的嚴重擁堵，令該區內道路沒有傳聞，道路自然暢通。</p> <p>小市民(言) 2016年2月13日</p>	2016-02-13 13:56:03
920	<p>本人不認為現時為恰當時機推出電子道路收費。首先，中環場仔鐘道及新橋道隧道並未完成，即使在中環地區採取電子道路收費，道路使用者因沒有其他可行的替代道路，也會願意付費使用道路，對改善道路擁塞狀況並沒有實際效用。</p> <p>如收費，則應由西環中環聯起，至北角地區劃為收費區域，在每天的上、下午繁忙時間均需收費，並不能提供任何豁免，即使政府車輛及緊急車輛亦需付費，以減低壟用情況。</p> <p>收費方式可參考現在隧道的電子收費系統，所有車輛到時需強制安裝有關設備，有關公司只能收集駕駛者的姓名、身份證號碼、車牌號碼及駕駛者的地址，有關資料亦應儲存在獨立的網絡資料庫，政府可考慮從電子道路收費所得收入部分取為代道路使用者的手續費用，讓道路使用者不用繳付道路收費以外的手續費。</p> <p>收費稱員阻撓仍用，以讓非必須使用道路的車輛降低其使用道路意欲，以2016年計算，每次收費不應少於每次15港元，而途過收費的車輛需繳付不少於收費的100倍作罰款以收阻撓用途。</p>	2016-02-12 22:17:34
919	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 劃設「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費區界線</li> <li>2 同意,應包括上環、金鐘、灣仔、銅鑼灣。</li> <li>3 區域因為收費機制可以因偵測車輛而做到用者自付原則及發揮效用。</li> <li>4 認同「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」須在收費區交通流量高的時段內收費。</li> <li>5 不認同「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」不須在星期日和公眾假期收費。</li> <li>6 我認為「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」應根據車輛的載重量收取不同費用(即載重量較高的車輛可付較低的費用)。</li> <li>7 我認為電子道路收費應定於(乙)假如是按每次駛進收費(即每次經過收費點均收費一次),才能令駕駛者改變其駕駛行為。</li> <li>8 除緊急車輛外,我支持「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」向公共巴士及公共小巴提供豁免/優惠。</li> <li>9 整體而言,你認為「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」應較適合採用短距離微波通訊科技。</li> <li>12 同意「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費水平需要定期檢討,並在有需要時作出調整,以維持其成效。</li> <li>13 你對「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」所稱的記賬撥款,將所有車牌重新發出(按原道距離微波通訊科技及加上銀行帳戶作收費之用)以免用家遭欠。</li> </ol>	2016-02-12 21:05:24
918	<p>收費的目的都只是想減少車主使用，即是皆肯付錢就用到，那樣就不好，為何不將電子號碼作道路使用方法，就像國家北京等的安排，假如，車牌上有5字就星期五可使用，其他車牌號碼也有其他的處理方式。</p>	2016-02-10 21:08:23

W00331

W00330

W00329

W00328

<p>Q17</p>	<p>After reviewing the document and questions and from the Focused group yesterday, I have the following feedback:</p> <p>First of all, I fully support the measure to relieve congestion in Central.</p> <p>The Pilot Scheme area and boundary should avoid the residential area as far as possible to minimise impact in order to gain support from the affected community.</p> <p>Suggest to cover Central &amp; Admiralty rather than Sheung Wan.</p> <p>For the charging mechanism, it would be better to have an the cordon-based charging with a ceiling at a day. The charge level should be set at a level acceptable by the public.</p> <p>I agree that charges should be imposed throughout the hours in a day when the traffic flow is high in the charging area or when congestion is observed.</p> <p>No charges should be imposed during Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>I agree an approach to be fair to all road users. Differential charge on vehicle sizes is generally acceptable. However, I believe the transport trade will have different views.</p> <p>I prefer a hybrid charge - the per-pass-basis with a ceiling per charging day.</p> <p>Suggest no exemption / concession to vehicles other than emergency vehicles to simplify the charging system and make it more efficient. For buses, passengers can benefit from a small reduction in fare.</p> <p>On technology, I think by the time the system is implemented, we have more options to consider.</p> <p>We should address the protection of privacy in the Central District and ensure the general public that information collected will be used solely for the charging system and enforcement.</p> <p>For the indicators on the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Pilot Scheme, suggest to include before and after congestion level, air quality emission level etc.</p> <p>I generally agree that the charging level should be review regularly, adjusted and publish where necessary in order to maintain the effectiveness of Pilot Scheme?</p> <p>Other measures to be considered which could complement the implementation of the Pilot Scheme included increase meter parking charges in the area, like they did in London Westminster City Council, higher penalty charges and fine for illegal parking, enhance enforcement, bus priority etc.</p> <p>The above are my personal views and suggestions.</p> <p>Francis Sootoo, Honorary Treasurer, ACEHK 4 Feb 2016</p>		<p>2016-02-04 10:05:21</p>
<p>Q16</p>	<p>不同意實行電子道路收費計劃，因為</p> <p>(1) 這些計劃會令運輸成本增加，現在生意已經好難做，反對所有百上加斤措施。</p> <p>(2) 這計劃方便了富人，害了中產。</p> <p>本人如不欲公開其姓名、名稱、及其他個人資料。</p>		<p>2016-02-03 11:25:41</p>
<p>Q15</p>	<p>About the "呂體琴題" my comments are:</p> <p>Q1. Disagree. Q2. Disagree. Q3. - Q13 as I disagree on Q1 and Q2 therefore not need to provide any comments on Q3 through Q13.</p>		<p>2016-02-02 10:15:02</p>

W00327

W00326



W00325

914	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I think electronic road pricing is absolutely unacceptable. This is another tool that the rich would have priority over the average person to use public facilities.</p> <p>As talked about widely by many people and the media, traffic jam in Central and other urban area is due to the increasing number of chauffer cars illegally parked alongside the already busy and narrow streets. Plus most of them would leave the engine on to run the a/c in summer. This is purely selfishness on the part of the chauffer and their bosses. In many roads, these parked cars makes others impossible to disembark or embark their passengers and they ended up doing it in the middle of the road, and thus causing ever worse traffic jams - and dangerous for the passengers. Why is that our police are not doing anything to stop these selfish practice???</p> <p>If the electronic road pricing is introduced, these drivers would be even more encouraged to park their cars in the jammed streets, because if they keep driving around, they will be charged over and over again.</p> <p>Police must issue illegal parking tickets to these cars, and they must be issued without warning. At present, most police and traffic wardens would only ask the chauffers to drive their cars away. Soon as the police officer or traffic wardens left, the cars came back. Nothing is changed.</p> <p>If the police could do that even for a week, the problem will go away. These car owners must understand that they have to wait for their cars instead of the cars waiting for them.</p> <p>I heard the argument that if the Police does that, the chauffers would only drive around and around - I don't think so, it would be too much work for them. They rather drive further away from the jammed streets and find a quiet spot further away and take a rest.</p> <p>Your truly, A non-driver working in Admiralty.</p>	2016-02-01 19:17:50
-----	---	------------------------

W00324

913	<p>反對電子道路收費先導計劃 不如立法直接要求已用10年或以上駕意不准在路上行駛 收費都會有意..問題點去減少車輛..唔係收費..香港人太多錢..唔係你收一收?</p>	2016-02-01 12:16:34
-----	---	------------------------

W00323

912	<p>反對電子道路收費先導計劃 不如強行人道路都收費..減少行人啦! 香港太多人..太多車..</p>	2016-02-01 12:12:04
-----	---	------------------------

W00322

911	<p>反對電子道路收費先導計劃 收費路唔係咩方法.</p>	2016-02-01 12:08:30
-----	-----------------------------------	------------------------

W00321

910	<p>It is no use to charge even HKD100 per entry of central. A great percentage of cars are driven by chauffeur stopping or circling while the police and traffic warden seldom ticketing them.</p> <p>This is also true for taxi drivers who stop on double yellow line near new world centre and waiting for customers near melbourne centre. I have never seen the police and traffic warden issuing infringement notice against taxi driver near that area.</p> <p>The people who can afford a chauffeur which paid up to \$16,000 or more a month would prefer the car readily available and would care less if they have to pay HKD100 or HKD200 more a day.</p> <p>If you set it at HKD100 or even more per entry, those cars driven by chauffeur would just remain in the toll area until the next time their employer need them which would not solve the traffic jam at all.</p> <p>One of the good idea to solve the traffic congestion is to build more parking and share the profits from issuing parking infringement notice with the police department so as to provide them incentives to issue ticket to all of the road users especially taxi stop illegally and luxury car with chauffeur stopping at no waiting zone.</p> <p>I have seen many times that police officers exercising their discretion and ticketing only the private cars and leaving the taxi and minibus which are breaking the same rule alone.</p> <p>I would only agree with the electronic pricing on the grounds that it is charged against all road users and provided that the police stop exercising their discretion against certain road users.</p>	2016-02-01 04:27:18
-----	---	------------------------

W00320

909	<p>我覺得在本地區實施電子道路收費只會把大量汽車趕到另外一區大量聚集如灣仔、金鐘、上環等等，製造一個自作聰明、自以為是的交通擠塞問題.....是治標不治本，會引起天怒人怨，我有以下意見、可行建議</p> <p>政府應考慮雙數日准許行車，商用汽車當然要豁免，因為他們是運作香港經濟的幕後英雄.....推行商業運作、推動經濟等等。</p> <p>對於一些應用私家車作商業運作的團體或公司，他們都是有必要用車的，這個問題可加強用車家對於他們在不准用車的双數或單數日子，並要求他們自動申報多用汽車日子至運輸局進行徵費，而交通警務每天在路面進行抽檢或捉見紀錄(如私家車在單數日行雙數車數的意)，這是很容易監察及操作的。</p> <p>對於有之前或事後申報的意當然無害，而對那些沒申報的就加罰罰款以收阻嚇作用，久而久之，私家車會在有必要時才會用車，或在違反日子下付費用車，這必然做到全港每天路面行車減少及治本。</p> <p>關於詳細操作細節意見，及一些其他引關聯的看法及意見，敬請聯絡本人：關先生</p>	2016-01-31 14:08:28
-----	--	------------------------

W00319

908	I strongly DISAGREE with the implementation of ERP in Central. This is just another means of making motorists pay for more government revenue. Motorists already pay for a significant burden in the society's revenue to the government. They should not be forced to increase their share. There are other options to limit traffic in a specific area, free of charge. Use of odd/ even numbered vehicle license plate should help reduce traffic congestion instantly, free of charge, and should be given a trial before implementing for charging schemes like ERP.	2016-01-30 17:44:25
907	I am a motorist in Hong Kong and drive on average 40-50km a day myself. While I strongly support an ERP system and hope that this will reduce traffic, i'm really not sure how effective such a system would be in Hong Kong. This is due to the fact that the cost of owning and operating a vehicle in Hong Kong is so high already, any ERP scheme would not be a considerable factor for motorists to use or not use certain roads... I don't think the habits of a lot of motorists would change just because they have to pay a bit more. This would only serve to perhaps increase the costs of commercial vehicles and in term the cost of delivery and public transportation.	2016-01-30 13:48:35
906	I think the system is punishing those who live in the vicinity who must use daily the roads in question. Won't it create inconvenience to them and an extra financial load? The culprit leading to the existing congested traffic is those who illegally park and wait for their bosses on the roads of busy district. Please exercise more stringent penalization of undisciplined drivers before enforcement of e-road charge system. Thanks.	2016-01-29 09:55:00
905	Please may I know if the Electronic Road Pricing (ERP) is only applicable to private cars. Are Taxis excluded? For the ERP to work effectively, Taxis have to be exempted from ERP so that the public will ride Taxis and leave their private cars at home and this will ease congestion on the roads. It is the private cars that cause congestion on the roads. If someone can afford to buy a car, they can afford to pay the Toll and will drive their private cars irrespective of ERP. ERP will be a failure. IF TAXIS ARE EXEMPTED FROM ERP, PEOPLE WILL RIDE TAXIS AND LEAVE THEIR PRIVATE CARS AT HOME. THIS IN RETURN WILL EASE THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION.	2016-01-28 16:59:52
904	非常讚成電子道路收費，並向私家車/電單車(不論是公司車或私人車)及的士收取此費用來減少道路擠塞。不應向公共服務的車輛如巴士及小巴等收取。 至於收費，可以考慮按出入次數及逗留時間作考慮，即先收入場，再按時間收，並於星期一至六早上8點到晚上9點，因為基本上平日幾乎沒有非繁忙時間，所以以LUNCH TIME (12-2)，早上返工(8-10)及放工(5-8)應多收費，其餘時間是DISCOUNT，星期日就不用收費。 在技術層面，可以全面要求車主從新領牌及加入安裝車內裝置，相對以自動車牌識別科技為方便，而且也可以同時減少車牌，每按就無得違章及錯牌。 呢個世界都無咩私隱，用得INTERNET 就無咩啦，所以不用擔心。 「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的成效時，應採用甚麼指標，按車速及污染指數，以及數量作為指標，如果未達標就加價。	2016-01-28 12:46:40

W00318

W00317

W00316

W00315

W00314

903

I am all for the proposed ERP scheme. My answers to your specific questions are as follows:

#### Charging area

Q.1 Do you have any views on how the boundary of the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme should be drawn up, and what are your reasons?

A. 1 The boundary should include the boundaries occupied by the Bank of China, Admiralty, Wellington street, Hollywood street, Shun Tak buildings.

Q.2 Do you think some neighbouring areas of Central, say some parts of Admiralty or Sheung Wan, should be covered in the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme? If so, which area(s)?

A.2 Yes. TD should have the information to best make the ERP scheme workable and effective.

#### Charging mechanism

Q.3 Do you prefer an area-based or cordon-based charging mechanism for the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme? Why?

A. Either will do.

#### Charging period

Q.4 Do you agree that ERP charges for the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme should be imposed throughout the hours in a day when the traffic flow is high in the charging area?

A.4 Yes.

Q.5 Do you agree that Sundays and public holidays should be excluded from the ERP charges for the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme? Do you have any other views on the charging period?

A.5 Yes Only Sundays and public holidays should be excluded from the ERP charges.

#### Charging level

Q.6 Which charging approach do you prefer for the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme – a unified charge for all vehicles, differential charges based on vehicle sizes (i.e. larger vehicles to be charged more), or differential charges based on a vehicle's carrying capacity (i.e. vehicles with higher carrying capacities to be charged at lower levels)?

A.6 A unified charge.

Q.7 Do you have any suggestion on the range of ERP charge which you believe could induce motorists to adjust their travel behaviour when (a) ERP charge is levied on a per day basis; or (b) ERP charge is levied on a per pass basis (charging at each and every charging point)?

A.7 To really discourage unnecessary road use, I would prefer a unified charge on a per pass basis to simplify and reduce administration costs.

#### Exemption and Concession

Q.8 Do you support providing exemption / concession to vehicles other than emergency vehicles for the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme? If so, what are the type(s) of vehicles and why do you choose them?

A.8 No. It would be easier for government to waive those vehicles that are genuinely require using the road for emergency reasons.

#### Technology

Q.9 DSRC technology requires the installation of an IVU in each vehicle entering the charging area for ERP payment, while ANPR technology captures the licence number plate of a vehicle every time when it enters / leaves / circulates in the charging area. On the whole, would you say that ANPR or DSRC is a more preferable technology for the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme?

A. 9 Either will do. What about the cost for the installation and removal of such devices. How would the government protects the levying of the charges when the vehicle(s) have been transferred to a different owner who may keep on using the transferred vehicle(s) but without formal re-registration?

2016-01-28  
08:20:54

W00313

W00312

W00311

W00310

W00309

W00308

W00307

	<p>Privacy Concern Q.10 Do you have any concern over the protection of privacy in the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme? What are your concern(s) and how do you think it/they could be addressed? A.10 None. Anyone who is afraid of privacy intrusion should know that the interested party(parties) will always find way to detect their whereabouts.</p> <p>Effectiveness Q.11 What indicators do you think we should use to evaluate the effectiveness of the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme? A.11 Evaluate the throughput of vehicles/unit time.</p> <p>Q.12 Do you agree that the charging level should be reviewed regularly and adjusted where necessary in order to maintain the effectiveness of the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme? A.12 Yes</p> <p>Complementary measures Q.13 Do you have any suggestions on measures which could complement the implementation of the Central District ERP Pilot Scheme? A. 13 TD should have installed warning signs to notify that the vehicles are entering the ERP scheme area and there should be alternate escape roads for any vehicle to escape the scheme area. Make sure this will not create more traffic congestion!</p>		
902	<p>ERP is back on the transport policy agenda in Hong Kong now. A lot of researchers believe the irresistible force of increasing traffic demand meets the immovable object of fixed road space in the Central, the benefits to be gained from intervening with ERP grow greater. Even the academic professors rush to agree and support the implementation of so-called pilot scheme in the Central.</p> <p>With such a pilot scheme, there will be another new topic for them to do the research. Hong Kong is just a very city but facing the cracking in the whole society. Hong Kong do not need any topics to further deepen the gap between the rich and the poor. If you are rich, will you mind to pay in order to enjoy the smooth traffic. The answer is simple.</p> <p>No matter how we, the poor sector, object. Will the Government listen to it? This is another political game to play. Holding the power to raise our view, I object, object and object the pilot scheme in Central. If there is no choice to impose driving restriction, I totally support the quota system of holding private car.</p>		2016-01-28 00:37:53
901	<p>中环塞车是由于私家车在路边停泊，令商用车要在路中心落货，并被票控，若推行电子道路收费，只会令中环成为「有钱人地带」，担心影响生计，反对电子道路收费。</p>		2016-01-28 00:23:46
900	<p>聽我吐苦呀，我哋唔啱出中環喇啦。 許耀鴻 經途</p>		2016-01-27 15:18:21
899	<p>Please also think of some more methods to handle the problem of traffic congestion.</p>		2016-01-27 15:04:10
898	<p>Very good ! Agreed !!!! Please handle the problem immediately.</p>		2016-01-27 15:03:08
897	<p>復康巴士, 易搭巴士, 易搭輪之類服務傷殘者的車輛應該免收。 任何的士若其乘客持有傷殘證者亦可免收(或退回)。可在現有 禁區上落車紙 加添此項。</p>		2016-01-27 13:04:53
896	<p>我叫蘇溫暉</p>		2016-01-27 10:48:36

W00306

895	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Along the whole queen's road till queen's road west and hollywood road. Traffic is extremely slow and lots of illegal stopping vehicles.</li><li>2. Sheung wan should be included.</li><li>3. No, anything with 4 wheels and use fossil fuel should be charged.</li><li>4. 7:30am to 10:30 am. 4:30 pm to 8:30 pm</li><li>5. yes</li><li>6. higher charge for bigger vehicles and higher charges for vehicles enter the toll zone more than twice a day.</li><li>7. Per pass basis HKD20 per charging point. Double the amount starting from the fifth charging point within a day.</li><li>8. No. The purpose is to decrease the traffic flow and encourage use of MTR.</li><li>9. IVU</li><li>10. The card in the IVU should be able to remove.</li><li>11. No more cars stopping at the queen's road near new world tower</li><li>12. Adjusted every 3 months is better</li></ol>		2016-01-27 08:51:07
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00305

W00304

W00303

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
894	fuabsdkfjhao		2016-01-26 11:26:54
893	<p>1. queen's road &amp; garden road till queen's road west &amp; hollywood road. Queen's road is jammed from garden road till hollywood road everyday.</p> <p>2. Places where illegal parking is serious should be covered. Like hollywood road near Tung Wah Hospital should be covered to tackle illegal parking vehicles obstructing emergency vehicles.</p> <p>3. Area based, difficult to justify carbon footprint.</p> <p>4. 7am to 11 am, 4 to 8pm. Agree</p> <p>5. Yes sunday should be exempted, but not saturday.</p> <p>6. Flat rate is better.</p> <p>7. EPR should be levied per pass basis and double as number of passes in a day exceed certain threshold to tackle vehicles circling around central for hours. Also need to enforce strict parking infringement by the police with in the charging area.</p> <p>8. No vehicles should be exempted, the goal is to decrease the traffic flow during rush hours</p> <p>9. ANPR</p> <p>10. No release of photos or data to any law enforcement agency unless upon a court order which the parties being captured are duly notified.</p> <p>11. Time needed for a vehicle to travel from queen's road &amp; garden road to Queen's road west &amp; hollywood road.</p> <p>12. Charging level should be adjusted every 3 months depends on the effectiveness.</p>		2016-01-26 04:10:07
892	<p>反對電子道路收費先導計劃，計劃對全港車主不公平。          車主也有交稅也有交牌照，如果要解決，不如禁止私家車進入，或以雙單數車牌行使更好。</p> <p>當電子道路收費計劃進行，我相信：          1) 區內的其他道路交通更趨擁塞；紅磡 西區 東區 已是好例子。          2) 你們更加大條道路取消雙車          3) 增加巴士加價理由及藉口。          4) 更俾市民話為畜人而實行，官商勾結。</p> <p>所以完全反對~</p> <p>交通擁塞，市公所自己會選擇 MTR.</p> <p>反對：          1)反對提高1500CC 以下首次登記稅和牌照年費，因為代步，住郊區的怎算          2)反對增加咪錶泊車位的收費，只會使停車場加價，益商人。</p>		2016-01-25 21:45:23

W00302

891	<p>第一、中環鬧市問題並非最嚴重，全港多區都出現擠塞問題；觀塘繞道、將軍澳繞道來回、香港仔繞道來回、新政府書來回、德輔道繞道、孔徑、尖沙咀區區都難得比中環還嚴重，為何繼續在擠擁收道路收費？為何選擇錫化這個地區？</p> <p>第二、中環有不少地方在繁忙時段已設有禁區如單邊，非公務車不得在繁忙時段（早七晚七）駛進，已經解決擠塞問題。如果道路收費實施又會否取消道路管制？如沒有，這就是對道路使用者的雙重罰則。</p> <p>第三、為居住在收費區的市民帶來不便。有一部分居民居所附近並沒有設地鐵站、巴士站，部分屬非快捷巴士服務，就是有巴士的也只提供有限度服務，如果道路收費實施後，對區內居民交通造成不便；的士在道路收費區的收費也是研究的課題。</p> <p>以上種種說明了道路收費未能解決香港問題，請不要將其他國家的制度全照搬在香港，以英國為例，倫敦地方大，道路收費區設於著名景點、最繁華的地區，附近都設公共交通工具，如地鐵、巴士所範圍；如果你不想在道路收費區開車，也總有方法繞過你不想到的地方，但香港地少，中環就是港島區的中心，只要道路收費實施後，基本上所有在港島行駛的車輛都會被波及。</p>	2016-01-24 20:52:34
890	<p>第一、中環鬧市問題並非最嚴重，全港多區都出現擠塞問題；觀塘繞道、將軍澳繞道來回、香港仔繞道來回、新政府書來回、德輔道繞道、孔徑、尖沙咀區區都難得比中環還嚴重，為何繼續在擠擁收道路收費？為何選擇錫化這個地區？</p> <p>第二、中環有不少地方在繁忙時段已設有禁區如單邊，非公務車不得在繁忙時段（早七晚七）駛進，已經解決擠塞問題。如果道路收費實施又會否取消道路管制？如沒有，這就是對道路使用者的雙重罰則。</p> <p>第三、為居住在收費區的市民帶來不便。有一部分居民居所附近並沒有設地鐵站、巴士站，部分屬非快捷巴士服務，就是有巴士的也只提供有限度服務，如果道路收費實施後，對區內居民交通造成不便；的士在道路收費區的收費也是研究的課題。</p> <p>以上種種說明了道路收費未能解決香港問題，請不要將其他國家的制度全照搬在香港，以英國為例，倫敦地方大，道路收費區設於著名景點、最繁華的地區，附近都設公共交通工具，如地鐵、巴士所範圍；如果你不想在道路收費區開車，也總有方法繞過你不想到的地方，但香港地少，中環就是港島區的中心，只要道路收費實施後，基本上所有在港島行駛的車輛都會被波及。</p>	2016-01-24 20:51:37

W00301

W00300

889	<p>易維問題 收費區 問1 你對於如何劃分「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費區界線有何意見？ 反對 原因為何？ 無助減少塞車</p> <p>問2 你認為鄰近中環的其他地區，如金鐘或上環的部分地方，是否應納入「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」內？ 反對 如同意，應包括哪些地區？ 收費機制</p> <p>問3 你認為「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」應採用區域基本收費機制，還是周界基本收費機制？原因為何？ 反對收費 收費時段</p> <p>問4 你是否認同「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」須在收費區交通量高的時段內收費？ 反對收費</p> <p>問5 你是否認同「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」不須在星期日及公眾假期收費？你對於收費時段有何其他意見？ 反對收費</p> <p>收費水平 問6 你認為「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」應採用哪一個收費模式- 對所有車輛同一收費、根據車輛大小收取不同費用(即較大型的車輛需繳付較高的費用)或根據車輛的載客量收取不同費用(即載客量較高的車輛可付較低的費用)？ \$0</p> <p>問7 你認為電子道路收費應定於哪一個水平(甲)假如是按日收費(或乙)假如是按每次駛經收費(即每次經過收費點均收費一次)，才能令駕駛者改變其駕駛行為？ 豁免及優惠 N/A</p> <p>問8 除豁免車輛外，你是否支持「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」向其他類型的車輛提供豁免/優惠？如果同意，哪些類型的車輛應獲豁免/優惠？原因為何？ N/A</p> <p>科技 問9 把超臨界微波通訊科技與每部車輛在進入收費區的安裝區內裝置以進行電子道路收費；而自動車輛識別科技則稱置在車輛每次駛進/駛離收費區或在收費區內道路行駛時拍攝其特徵。總體而言，你認為「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」應較適合採用超臨界微波通訊科技，還是自動車輛識別科技？ 對私隱的關注 N/A</p> <p>問10 你對「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的私隱保護有關注嗎？你的關注是甚麼？你認為這些關注應如何解決？ 十分關注</p> <p>成效 問11 你認為在評估「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的成效時，應該採用甚麼指標？ 無科學化的評估</p> <p>問12 你是否同意「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費水平需要定期檢討，並在有需要時作出調整，以維持其成效？ N/A</p> <p>配套措施 問13 你對「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」所稱的配套措施有何建議？ 不推行中國電子道路收費先導計劃 取消電動車豁免首次登記費/每年牌照費減免 限制法例容許的私家車使用中環某些塞車路段 增加交通警務員數目，提高違例罰款</p>		2016-01-23 19:44:05
888	This will basically prohibit the less well off, from driving and only allow thr wealthy to have cars. As that is a fact, let's not make it so complicated. Just make the license more expensive.		2016-01-23 17:20:44

W00299



W00298

887	<p>第一、中環擴車問題並非新問題，全港多區都出現擴車問題；彌敦道、將軍澳隧道來回、香港仔隧道來回、彌敦道來回、橫街與彌敦、元朗、尖沙咀區區都顯得比中環擴車，為何選擇在這裡設道路收費？為何選擇擴化這地區？</p> <p>第二、中環有不少地方在繁忙時段已設有禁區如藍道，非公務車不得在繁忙時段（早七晚七）駛進，已解決交通擁塞問題，如果道路收費實施又會否取消道路管制？如沒有，這就是對道路使用者的雙重罰則。</p> <p>第三、為居住在收費區的市民帶來不便，有一部分居民居所附近並沒有地鐵站、巴士站，部分屬尚未發展區，就是非巴士的也只提供有限度服務，如果道路收費實施後，對區內居民交通造成不便；的士在道路收費區的收費也是研究的課題。</p> <p>以上種種說明了道路收費未能解決香港問題，請不要將其他國家的制度全盤照搬在香港，以英國為例，倫敦地方大，道路收費區設於著名景點、最繁華的地區，附近都被公共交通工具，如地鐵、巴士所包圍；如果你不想在道路收費區開車，也總有方法繞過去你想到的地方，但香港地少，中環就是港島區的中心，只要道路收費實施後，基本上所有在港島行駛的車輛都會被波及。</p>	2016-01-23 10:32:16
886	<p>政府為何不選擇：道路收費的源頭(停止新發行車証)的士牌停發、小巴牌停發、新車牌停發停發。 為何私家車、電單車牌。 亦可鼓勵單車、環保呢。 其他細節官老爺們研究吧。</p>	2016-01-22 23:37:07
885	本人覺得就公共交通工具和電單車免費無稱收費，特別電單車，因為電單車無可能令道路擁塞，和收費有困難，隧道也沒有自動收費予電單車，中環擴車主因是太多私家車!	2016-01-22 21:30:07
884	If there is a building outside of central which provides parking lot, there is a economic attraction for people park their cars outside central. Parking is expensive and hard to find in central. There will be shuttle bus from parking lot to central. Then the fee charge for driving in central can substitute shuttle bus to work place in central. Or something like New York subway, I think most people go to certain building in central and in certain times. If they work late at night, they can take taxi from their workplace to parking lot around 20 dollars, less than parking fee in central.	2016-01-22 15:08:56
883	<p>For the ERP, in other country named as road pricing, it is an old story issue being discussed, evaluated and debated for a long time in Hong Kong.</p> <p>If you consider the success of its implementation in Singapore, London, etc, this could pave a positive direction for Hong Kong case, particularly in the Central. You should spend some time to research the successful criteria in other country, particularly the administration and political situation behind.</p> <p>For London case, some occasions, a simple question, has the London charging scheme achieved its objectives? Yes, it can produce a simple answer, in this case is yes. However, the reason behind is that there is a strong Government administration.</p> <p>For Singapore case, the answer is, of course, yes. It is because Singapore has much more stronger Government administration. The success of the road pricing in Singapore is a show case for the Singapore administration to demonstrate the strong political administration and management.</p> <p>Back to Hong Kong, the implementation of road pricing will be very much depended on the determination and political stand of the Government administration. Now, the Government is facing the criticism by the LegCo members. At various aspects, the Government administration seems to be weak and does not receive the necessary support from the public. Unless there is a more productive and cooperative relationship between the Government and the LegCo members, who treat themselves as strong politician, it is largely a case of resulting a failure at the end.</p> <p>The working principle of road pricing is practical and effective by itself, only theoretically. Back to the real world with human, particularly, people in Hong Kong, it will certainly be another political crisis. It will be more beneficial to save the Government resources somewhere, other than to implement the road pricing. To be a direct view, the ERP, i.e. road pricing, should not be implemented in Hong Kong.</p>	2016-01-22 00:36:56
882	Why not charge \$500 per visit to the Central for any vehicles with the capacity of over 2,000cc. To restrict all heavy vehicles entering the Central. Money is the power, man, you know.	2016-01-20 23:55:54
881	Objection, Objection and objection. Objection to any proposal under the "698" power.	2016-01-20 23:52:50
880	<p>The ERP concept is good, but it is not practical in Hong Kong such as a city. Now, the proposal is to implement in Central only, which is even a smaller area. The ERP should cover the whole territory, not just the Central, if it is to be applied.</p> <p>The ERP scheme is not supported and the so-called pilot scheme is also not supported. If necessary, why not to introduce a day pass system, such as to classify HK Island, Kowloon and NT separately. For example, \$100 dollar for a day pass for one of the three region.</p>	2016-01-20 23:52:02

W00297

W00296

W00295

W00294

W00293

W00292

W00291

W00290

879	good		2016-01-20 16:41:23
W00289	878	Hi my business. I have a small SME, less than 5 employees. We have a Van on the road all the time. I don't want any congestion charging or fees  Business hard enough already  Matthew Murdoch	2016-01-20 12:12:11
W00288	877	Dear Sir,  The ERP should exclude some vehicles such as motorbike which not cause traffic jam.	2016-01-19 23:46:13
W00287	876	Most congestion is caused by chauffeur driven cars of either business men or rich individuals. Also they 'expect' their car to be available close by and on demand. The chauffeurs has no other option than to park in side street s or rotate slowly around the road network so to available on call.  Taxi's also are uncontrolled and contribute to the problem. They need proper management and control to get best benefit from this useful service way ahead of investing into a traffic charging mechanism.  An ERP system will be welcomed by the rich who can afford the premium and not help the normal people of Hong Kong. How great to pay a few hundred dollars a month to get more privilege on the road !!  In addition what will the revenue be used for by TD? How will the public benefit or is it used to pay for the system and create unnecessary jobs in administrating this system?  How about allowing 4 to 7 trips through key gateways per week 'free' and using vehicle registration plate recognition to monitor and charge? For people like myself who live in Mid Levels and drive through central then accept able to do so once a day for free. More trips per day then please charge people.  Why not segregate the tram route from road traffic so they really do get priority and not blocked by road traffic. This will make them more effective, more attractive and remove car drivers.  We have great infrastructure in HK and plenty of transport options - why interfere more? Let the best service win and if the road network is 'logged' then people will find other ways to travel.	2016-01-19 22:17:15
W00286	875	堅持反對, 1.收費少,10元改變不了.勞師動眾. 2.收得多政府唔敢收,有本港每程收够500元一定能達到目標,我會支持. 3.有唔地方塞車,龙翔道人九龍橋,人官橋區,土瓜灣天橋往油蔴地,為何只堵中區,無非只為有錢人家添阻撻.	2016-01-19 21:56:58
W00285	874	中環塞車,根本問題係非法泊車,尤其老板車. 電子道路收費計劃根本係完全錯,用錯的,唔該聽. 應該推行,中環非法泊車,即即拖車計劃,將非法泊車,即即拖走,立即解決塞車問題,扣車場設像北區口岸,例如羅便,非法泊車人士,取車費繳付所有拖車,停車費用,再加罰款 10萬,再扣20分,問題包保立即解決.	2016-01-19 21:53:12
W00284	873	反對電子道路收費,在繁忙地區如中環很難有替代路綫到達中環. 香港政府早於80年代便開始討論電子道路收費的可行性,但由於幾代官員都認為很難以落實,只好不斷委託顧問公司進行一個又一個研究,除完成幾份研究報告外,也就再沒有其他作為了. 反對做又一個研究,浪費時間和金錢.	2016-01-19 02:28:13
W00283	872	One of the basic objectives of establishing a good Government is to bring about development and improvement in the standard of living of the people at the affordable level. Using the historic information, the ERP study did not come into practice any times. It is just a new study one after another. This time, it will repeat the same and follow the same track of spending money but achieve nothing. Under the British administration, it did not succeed. How will it be possible to implement it under such a non-effective implementation of government decisions ?? I totally disagree with the proposal.	2016-01-19 02:18:25
W00282	871	Object to the proposal. They are that low income earners will not be able to afford the price. The introduction of the ERP will actually affect the people with lower income, in the sense that their expenditure will increase. Another factor is the movement of congestion from the Central to other areas. In order to avoid using paid roads, drivers will try to shift their journey to side roads and thus increasing the traffic congestion elsewhere.  No good thing to be created by the Government under such a poor administration.	2016-01-19 02:08:58

W00281

870 I strongly oppose to the electronic Road pricing scheme. This will penalized citizens who need to drive to central for various needs.

Traffic congestion is largely due to a huge number of empty buses getting into Central and adjacent area during peak hours. In particular, I often see 3 parallel lines of empty buses waiting outside Pacific Place towards central. Buses queue up in 3 parallel lines trying to get into the bus stop. This creates a terrible backlog of traffic congestion behind it. The bus company urgently needs to streamline the frequency and numbers of buses.

There should be increasing number of traffic wardens giving out tickets to illegal parking/ waiting in Central.

With the completion of the Central Wanchai bypass, a lot of cars will use the bypass and avoid going through central when they drive from east to west and vice versa. This will diminish the traffic problem in central when the project is completed.

2016-01-19 01:14:15

W00280

889 香港三十載 - 還來的電子道路收費計劃

從1983年起，香港政府曾為電子道路收費 (Electronic Road Pricing) 作出三次可行性研究，着手解決交通擠塞問題。不過，鑑於當時經濟環境、市民對私隱的顧慮，以及社會對此類新的收費未能凝聚共識，電子道路收費最終未有實行。

2014年，由交通諮詢委員會提交予運輸及房屋局局長的報告中指出，為解決本港道路交通擠塞，建議應儘快實施「電子道路收費先導計劃」。這局亦於去年12月底就此先導計劃進行為期3個月的公眾討論，以便社會對一連串有關事項進行討論，尋求共識。

其實，中環及其鄰近地區是傳統商業核心區，一直受到交通擠塞問題困擾。針對中環及其鄰近地區的交通擠塞問題，特區政府認為電子道路收費是一個合理的解決辦法，因為香港各區均有不同公共交通工具可乘搭到中環及其鄰近地區；而當中環灣仔繞道興建後，將可提供一條免費替代路線，供駕駛者行經相關區域而不需進入收費區。

雖然外國很多大城市如新加坡、倫敦等成功推行了電子道路收費計劃，但大多數的本地駕駛者對電子道路收費仍有不少誤解和顧慮。比如，電子道路收費是否對駕駛者實行另一項徵稅？如何解決技術和私隱問題？收費是按車種、大小、或載客量而定？甚至乎，市民對那種車輛可獲豁免、收費時段、路稅的劃分等，均持不同的意見。在經濟環境轉趨的今天，市民和駕駛者對新收費和計劃定會有所異議，而關鍵是有關當局必須與各持份者積極當中調解。

電子道路收費計劃的目的是促進道路使用的效率，它可鼓勵市民更多乘搭公共交通工具，及乘坐更多乘客共用一輛私家車。電子道路收費亦會直接影響駕駛者的行車路線選擇，因為進入電子道路收費區會增加開支，從而「鼓勵」駕駛者考慮免費替代路線或改在別收費時段才進入收費區。從整體社會效益及根據其他城市實施的經驗，電子道路收費確實減少收費區內的車輛行駛數目及增加行車速度，甚至對區內的空氣質素有着干的改善。

我們更可以預見市民和駕駛者在實施電子道路收費計劃後會有以下的轉變：

- 部份外出者(如的士乘客)會選擇給付加費以駛進收費區；
- 其他外出者如果某目的地在收費區內，大多數會改用公共交通工具，或把行程安排在收費時段以外前往；
- 一些主要是購物或休閒而外出的人士會改到收費區以外地方停車或辦事；
- 公共交通工具如巴士、小巴或會因應收費區而改變行車路線或增加收費；
- 的士乘客會較私家車使用者對收費更為敏感，他們或會改用公共交通工具；
- 途經的車輛若不進入收費區內任何地面範圍，可以選擇使用免費的替代道路；
- 對貨運業界，由於大部分收貨貨點是固定的，所以大多數貨運車輛會付費，部分則會在可行情況下更改行程時間，但相關運費和成本會相應增加。

總結

電子道路收費相信是政府研究時間最長的政綱之一，好比全民退休保障制度，非常複雜。筆者認為要解決香港交通擠塞問題，應該要多管齊下（如：優化三條海底隧道交通、增加中環和商業核心區違例泊車罰款、設立中環行人專用區、使用環保交通工具等，這才能有效解決交通問題，「路通人通，車車暢通」！

袁尚文、于承志  
城市智庫 - 香港經濟及物流政策研究中心  
電話：  
傳真：

2016-01-18 18:10:44

W00279

888 I drive everyday and I do go to Central and other busy areas often. I think what is causing traffic jam is many chauffeurs parking/double parking on side of roads. They hang around to wait for their bosses instead of parking in car parks. I hardly ever see police around and even if there are, they don't give out tickets. They simply ask the chauffeurs to drive off. Chauffeurs would drive off and go back to the same spot and carry on waiting.

ERP will not solve the problem since the people who hire chauffeurs are usually the richer people, therefore they won't care much about the charge, plus they will only be paying once only. Hence the chauffeurs hang around in those areas throughout the day. The only people who will be affected are the ones who do need to go to those areas to get business done.

2016-01-18 00:16:45

W00278

887 在中環及其鄰近地區推行電子道路收費是可行的，可參考新加坡做法。因為中環等地區交通繁忙，尤其是商業區，私家車數量多，政府雖然宣傳善用交通工具，

- 1) 鼓勵家收老開車費用。
- 2) 其他巴士及客貨車等費用可少些。
- 3) 如何避免堵塞？

2016-01-16 11:04:22



W00267

856	test	2016-01-14 16:38:07
857	WEB-INF/web.xml?	2016-01-14 16:38:07
858	/WEB-INF/web.xml?	2016-01-14 16:38:07
831	"	2016-01-14 16:38:08
832	-1));select pg_sleep(9); --	2016-01-14 16:38:08
833	/WEB-INF/web.xml?	2016-01-14 16:38:08
834	1")&%prompt(971897)	2016-01-14 16:38:08
835		2016-01-14 16:38:08
836	GaJdn7Br';select pg_sleep(9); --	2016-01-14 16:38:08

W00268

W00269

W00242

W00243

W00244

W00245

W00246

W00247

W00248

W00249

W00250

W00251

W00252

W00253

W00254

W00255

W00256

W00257

W00258

W00259

W00260

W00261

W00206

W00207

W00208

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
837	../../../../../../../../windows/win.ini		2016-01-14 16:36:06
838	"()&%prompt(919189)		2016-01-14 16:36:06
839			2016-01-14 16:36:06
840	zSDdzrG!);select pg_sleep(9); --		2016-01-14 16:36:06
841	../../../../../../../../boot.ini		2016-01-14 16:36:06
842	1_972913		2016-01-14 16:36:06
843	(select convert(int,CHAR(65)))		2016-01-14 16:36:06
844	WAoK(MpWT));select pg_sleep(9); --		2016-01-14 16:36:06
845	acunetix		2016-01-14 16:36:06
846	../../../../../../../../windows/win.ini.jpg		2016-01-14 16:36:06
847			2016-01-14 16:36:06
848	.....windowswin.ini		2016-01-14 16:36:06
849	../../../../../../../../windows/win.ini		2016-01-14 16:36:06
850	/../../../../../../../../windows/win.ini		2016-01-14 16:36:06
795	^(#S!@#S)(!))*****		2016-01-14 16:36:05
796	;print(md5(acunetix_vws_security_test));		2016-01-14 16:36:05
797	/etc/passwd		2016-01-14 16:36:05



W00227

816	dxEd95Bb'); waitfor delay '0:0:6' --	2016-01-14 16:38:05
817	file:///etc/passwd	2016-01-14 16:38:05
818	))	2016-01-14 16:38:05
819	\	2016-01-14 16:38:05
820	rd5CVfK5)); waitfor delay '0:0:6' --	2016-01-14 16:38:05
821	^.	2016-01-14 16:38:05
822	1	2016-01-14 16:38:05
823	/www.vulnweb.com	2016-01-14 16:38:05
824	-1);select pg_sleep(6); --	2016-01-14 16:38:05
825	WEB-INF/web.xml?	2016-01-14 16:38:05
826	&acunetixent;	2016-01-14 16:38:05
827	@@gmFvQ	2016-01-14 16:38:05
828	-1);select pg_sleep(6); --	2016-01-14 16:38:05
829	WEB-INF/web.xml?	2016-01-14 16:38:05
830	Jyl=	2016-01-14 16:38:05

W00228

W00229

W00230

W00231

W00232

W00233

W00234

W00235

W00236

W00237

W00238

W00239

W00240

W00241







W00177	766	'set set&set'		2016-01-14 16:38:04
W00178	767	-1 OR 2+947-947-1=0+0+0+1		2016-01-14 16:38:04
W00166	755	response.write(9284447*9236735)		2016-01-14 16:38:03
W00167	756	1		2016-01-14 16:38:03
W00168	757	'+response.write(9284447*9236735)+'		2016-01-14 16:38:03
W00165	754	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I currently live in Cypertport, but work in Kwun Tung.</p> <p>When I drive to work in both the morning and at night, I normally drive past Central but not go into Central. I don't think EPR should be charge to those going through Highway 4 / Connaught Rd towards the West side of Hong Kong Island (Kennedy Town / Pok Fu Lam / Western Tunnel). You may be asking why I don't go through Causeway Bay then via Aberdeen tunnel to go to Cypertport ? I would like to inform you that there is way more heavy traffic that way because of the traffic jam going to Kowloon and Times Square (Causeway Bay). I end up being stuck at that one point for over an hour !!!</p> <p>After reading the study, I think you need to think about where drivers are going. If you are not going into the heart of Central I don't feel ERP should be charged.</p> <p>Generally speaking there isn't much traffic in Central during the weekends so should EPR be charged ? Furthermore in my experience during both weekdays and weekends, there are other areas which is more congested than Central.</p> <p>Also will taxi's be allowed to charge ERP to customers ?</p> <p>Thanks</p>		2016-01-14 08:28:58
W00164	753	<p>I totally disagree with ERP Scheme. This scheme to me is more of a government collecting more money instead of providing Hong Kong citizen the root cause of the traffic problem.</p> <p>Did you ever realize if ERP went live, what would happen to other routes going to central. The problem will just be worst.</p> <p>In return, I think Government should look into more data collection or statistic regarding bus route and taxi. in the main route of Hong Kong island. The situation with buses blocking the road or Taxi has a long queuing is mostly the issue causing all the road traffic</p> <p>Also law enforcement on illegal parking or temporary stopping in order to reduce the issue</p>		2016-01-14 00:08:47
W00163	752	<p>The problem of traffic is mainly because of lacking of parking space. Cars are forced to circulating on road and stop on road side thus cause serious traffic jam.</p> <p>Electronic road pricing should not be implemented as it is not a solution to traffic jam. Government should provide more parking spaces, force all private buildings to provide hourly parking (also build enough car parks when building new buildings) and provide reasonable charge for short park. More cars can park at their desired places and thus less cars will be on roads.</p>		2016-01-13 17:09:28
W00162	751	<p>The experience in the uk is that the infrastructure and bureaucracy to run and monitor congestion charging zone cost more than the revenue generated.</p> <p>Further, as motorists became used to the idea of paying charges for driving into areas, traffic quickly filled up.</p> <p>Residents just outside congestion areas suddenly experienced massive traffic spikes as motorists ran the surrounding streets.</p> <p>It is hence a double negative for both the government and the motorist.</p>		2016-01-13 09:40:11
W00161	750	<p>如道路收費向所有車輛收費，這樣的土法一些私營交通工具會改另一條道路行駛，令坐車的市民要負擔更多的車費及令其他的道路更加塞車。這樣道路收費根本不能令道路暢通，反而令市民付更多車費及令其他道路更加塞車。故最好的方法是只向私家車收費。</p>		2016-01-12 21:32:33

W00160

749	<p>Q1. Gloucester Road &amp; Connaught Road Central. This is the main route in and out Central, connecting to both Cross Harbour Tunnels, therefore should be made an express way for those who need it.</p> <p>Q2. No need in the Pilot Scheme.</p> <p>Q3. Cordon-based. The objective is to free up an express way for priority traffic.</p> <p>Q4. ERP charges should be imposed throughout the day when traffic is high.</p> <p>Q5. Weekdays and weekends should both be included in the ERP charging according to traffic volume. This charging mechanism should be allowed to dynamically fluctuate within a minimum and maximum value, according to actual traffic.</p> <p>Q6. A unified charging for simplified implementation cost, with exception to certain licensed public transportation.</p> <p>Q7. No comment.</p> <p>Q8. Exception to emergency vehicles and licensed public transportation, e.g. buses.</p> <p>Q9. ANPR should be used in the Pilot Scheme. It will be impractical for the installation of IVU just for trial.</p> <p>Q10. Information collected should be limited to the number plates. Such information collected should only be used for the charging of the ERP Pilot Scheme, and not for any other purposes, should it be criminal or public interest.</p> <p>Q11. Average car speed, and satisfaction from drivers.</p> <p>Q12. Yes, at all times.</p> <p>Q13. No comment.</p>		2016-01-12 17:00:39
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00159

748	<p>第一、中環壘壘問題並非最嚴重，全港多區都出現壘壘問題；觀塘繞道、將軍澳繞道來回、香港仔繞道來回、漆咸道南來回、甚至銅鑼灣、元朗、尖沙咀區區壘壘比中環壘壘嚴重，為何選擇在這裡收道路收費？為何選擇確化這地區？</p> <p>第二、中環有不少地方在繁忙時段已設有禁區如藍道，非公務車不得在繁忙時段（早七晚七）駛過，已舒緩交通壘壘問題，如果道路收費實施又是否取消道路管制？如沒有，這就是對道路使用者的雙重罰則。</p> <p>第三、為居住在收費區的市民帶來不便，有一部分居民居所附近並未設有地鐵站、巴士站，部分居民未設巴士服務，就是有巴士的也只提供有限度服務，如果道路收費實施後，對區內居民交通造成不便；的士在道路收費區的收費也是研究的課題。</p> <p>以上種種說明了道路收費未能解決香港問題，請不要將其他國家的制度全盤照搬在香港，以英國為例，倫敦地方大，道路收費區設於著名景點、最繁華的地區，附近都被公營交通工具，如地鐵、巴士所包圍；如果你不想在道路收費區開車，也總有方法繞過你想到的地方，但香港地少，中環就是港島區的中心，只要道路收費實施後，基本上所有在港島行駛的車輛都會被波及。</p>		2016-01-12 13:26:02
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00158

747	<p>離道內不設停車等候，一次性離道式收費可能會令逗留收費區域內停車時間增加。</p> <p>控制繁忙區域內車輛數量與設停車場停止量相約，時間式收費應該較有效。逗留時間短可考慮免費，時間越長收費越貴甚至倍增，因而越壘壘收費越貴，減低繁忙時段車輛進入該區意欲。</p>		2016-01-12 09:57:25
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00157

746	<p>這個計劃的成效是在於減低道路使用者去收費區，從而減低壘壘情況，但香港現在交通問題原因，有否與其他地區相同，道路上以哪類主流車輛為多數，私家車為主導？工作車輛？</p> <p>私家車多是否與人購物消費有關，私家車數目是否太多？消費者購買車輛是否有實質需要，原因是公共交通設備未能切合安全、舒適、方便、快捷、便宜條件，令消費者減少使用，在收入有能力的人多買車，方便工作往返及假日，近年開始經濟走下，有機會出現失業及失業情況，加上近年關注年長人士退休後生活問題，政策會否增加市民交通費？會否增加運輸業成本上漲？</p> <p>政策有好目的，希望切合大部份在基層努力工作，為香港貢獻一生，令香港運作正常及繁榮安定的市民，而政策實行基本，我本人覺得為人設定為目的，想大家生活穩定，屬有定所，有三餐溫飽。</p>		2016-01-11 12:42:02
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00156

745	<p>反對，我認為明約壘壘問題去中環就一定是有需要，不能只為有錢人方便，壓窮人受苦，這是不公義。</p>		2016-01-11 08:28:30
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00155

W00154

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
744	<p>I live in Stanley Area of HK island.. We do not have any metro here this is very inconvenient, the buses are always taking hours to get to central.. + the amount I spend on taxi &amp; bus with the family I'm able to get by in the city with my own car... already the parking is quite expensive..</p> <p>I guess improving the transportation network before taxing people is more important (Metro coverage)..</p> <p>also taxing luxury cars more would be a better option.. anyways the rich don't care and will continue to use the roads.. So why not get even more revenues from the rich..</p> <p>People living in New territories or the souths side of HK island (which does not have a good train coverage) should be exempted or part-exempted or charged at discounted rate because they probably do not have any choice like me.. (I cannot spend 3 hours a day on public transport instead 1 with my car is a better option)</p>		2016-01-10 22:57:53
743	<p>電子道路收費計劃可能可以解決道路擠塞問題，但是這應該是確認其他可行的方案都達不到這目標才進行這方案。</p> <p>本人看到的是中區道路擠塞問題大部分是由違例泊車引致，例如：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 在德己立街和威靈頓街轉角位，我這經過兩次有巴士在上道轉角位而令到巴士不能轉入威靈頓街而引起嚴重交通擠塞至畢徹街。</li><li>2. 在皇后大道中新世界大廈常有巴士停泊在那邊而令到其他車輛要在第二行行車線上落客。</li><li>3. 在皇后大道中某年大廈常有巴士停泊在那邊而令到其他車輛要在第二行行車線上落客。</li></ol> <p>還有另外一個導致中區嚴重交通擠塞問題是</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 太多巴士在路上，巴士已有雙轉道中為導線，如果將其他行經皇后大道中的巴士改行雙轉道中，這就可以疏通皇后大道中的交通流量。</li><li>2. 太多貨車停泊在皇后大道中兩旁，如果能勸喻貨戶利用晚上時間上落貨，這就可以大大改善交通流量。</li></ol> <p>所以如果政府制定针对性的政策去解決這些合法或違例泊車問題，我相信中區交通擠塞問題應該可以大大改善。</p> <p>莊斯明</p>		2016-01-10 22:13:35

W00153

W00152

W00149

W00150

W00151

W00148

742	<p>There are MANY other congestion measures that should be taken before spending the public's money on an ERP system.</p> <p>In 2001 LegCo was told that ERP was a drastic step.</p> <p><a href="http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/tp/papers/legco-erp.pdf">www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/tp/papers/legco-erp.pdf</a></p> <p>Obviously before a drastic step is taken many smaller congestion management steps should be implemented.</p> <p>The game on the consultation page has a question about all the tools the government has used to manage congestion</p> <p><a href="http://www.erphk.hk/en/game/index.html">http://www.erphk.hk/en/game/index.html</a></p> <p>The answer is only one. Hoping people use public transport.</p> <p>This is surely very embarrassing to openly admit you currently have no congestion management techniques and you need to go straight to ERP. Willfully spending the public money on capital projects seems to be the answer to appalling quality governance.</p> <p>There are many steps that should be taken first.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) More bus lanes and bus priority scheme to encourage more public transport use. Currently 99 buses per Km of bus lane. - no changes since the handover</li> <li>2) Variable tolls on Government owned tunnels to maintain 40Km/hr - no changes since the handover</li> <li>3) Variable fee and more parking meters to ensure 10% are always free. (would reduce traffic by 20%) - no changes since the handover</li> <li>4) Review yellow and double yellow lines usage - no changes since the handover</li> <li>5) Red Line - NO STOPPING at all in busy urban corridor - no changes since the handover</li> <li>6) Additional tax on parking spaces in busy area - no changes since the handover</li> <li>7) More full time pedestrian zone - no changes since the handover</li> </ol> <p>As you can see from the very quick list above there has been an appalling lack of congestion management since the hand-over back to Beijing.</p> <p>Before wasting public money on a very complex and 'drastic' ERP system other simpler and much cheaper steps should be taken.</p> <p>Unfortunately the local leadership within Hong Kong has shown no ability to innovate.</p> <p>Please answer WHY the steps above will not be taken before ERP is introduced.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Edward</p>		2016-01-10 19:47:56
741	盡快實施，減輕公共交通擠塞。		2016-01-10 11:42:54
738	贊成於主要幹道（如：中環干諾道中皇后大道中、銅鑼灣告士打道等）尤其適用於非公共交通運輸工具。		2016-01-10 11:25:31
739	贊成於主要幹道（如：中環干諾道中皇后大道中、銅鑼灣告士打道等）尤其適用於非公共交通運輸工具。		2016-01-10 11:25:31
740	贊成於主要幹道（如：中環干諾道中皇后大道中、銅鑼灣告士打道等）尤其適用於非公共交通運輸工具。		2016-01-10 11:25:31
737	<p>本人反對電子道路收費及 質疑道路收費是否能夠解決塞車問題？ 電子道路收費是否唯一方法？ 除道路除了收費，沒有其他方法。 例如：擴闊路面，像北京單，雙號行車.....</p> <p>謝謝！</p>		2016-01-09 12:15:35

W00147	736	<p>The main problem is Hong Kong fewer roads and streets but too many vehicles, restrict the number of vehicles licenses is the best program, for the above locations shown solution to the problem is that all light goods vehicle s, medium goods vehicles, and heavy goods vehicles, restrict these vehicles from pm 7 to am 5 can drive the vehicles in these regions to unload and load the goods, the traffic will be good.</p> <p>Lai Chow Keung ( )</p>	2016-01-09 11:57:27
W00146	735	<p>I do not agree to the idea of having Central District Scheme.</p> <p>The current traffic issue in Central was due to illegal parking in Central District, most often on Ice House street, queen's road, Connaught Road and too many buses using the road, blocking traffic on Des Voux Road.</p>	2016-01-09 11:46:20
W00145	734	<p>I have lived in Singapore for 5 years and I can see why they need ERP to regulate traffic. The amount of traffic is indeed heavy. I was driving throughout my stay there.</p> <p>However, I do not see that need in Hong Kong because the flow of traffic is generally reasonable when everyone is respectful of the rules. In fact, I am impressed by how rarely I am caught in an extended traffic jam.</p> <p>Very often traffic is backed up because double and triple lanes are reduced to a single lane - caused by cars are parked and double parked illegally, with many drivers hanging around for extended periods waiting for their employers.</p> <p>In Central, Finance Street (from IFC Two carpark exit to passed Four Seasons Hotel), Ice House Street, Des Veoux Road (outside Princes Building), Queens Road Central (outside HSBC's HQ) are some of the areas that are often lined with illegally parked cars.</p> <p>Even when traffic police officers show up, they are lenient to drivers and just ask them to move on. In my opinion, this is not a good way to solve the issue. The drivers will just make a loop and return to the same spot. (Obviously, in cases where the drivers are chauffeurs, they are merely following instructions.) The only effective way to solve this problem is to strictly enforce the law - issue an immediate fine. People who can hire chauffeurs can afford to pay for parking and they should!</p> <p>I will not be supportive of ERP in Hong Kong until I have seen our traffic laws in relation to illegal parking being strictly enforced.</p>	2016-01-09 06:43:01
W00144	733	<p>I don't think ERP implementation should be limited to Central and its vicinity areas. Places like Causeway Bay, Tsim Sha Tsui and Mong Kok should also be implemented. Restricting the adoption to Central is simply discriminating those who frequently have to travel in and out of the Central area. If the other areas are not implemented, on the basis of fairness, Central should be not be implemented.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>	2016-01-08 13:26:44
W00143	732	<p>香港車多汽多，容易阻礙車牌識別系統，所以建議使用RFID技術的經過檢查車以識別，此技術可以同時用於其他交通管理，例如過例泊車時方便電子儀器發出告票，比手動輸入更快更準確！</p>	2016-01-07 23:06:54
W00142	731	<p>香港通往中環的道路之所以擠塞，基於這區域的國際化，那是城市規劃時沒有長遠的眼光！而且採用道路收費最大的受害者是商人！故本人不同意採納這方案，反而想問：為何不直接向車主買車及登記牌照申請大幅增加費用？這才是真正的用者自付！特別是私家車！</p>	2016-01-07 18:22:57
W00141	730	<p>I am strongly against your toll charges proposed. I am a resident of Central and by no choice I need to travel back and forth Central everyday to work and for school. If you are charging the road usage to the residents, it is not only unfair as we have no choice to go pass central to go home, it increases the financial burden of our livelihoods. Furthermore, the traffic jam was caused by many double parking cars and too many buses with empty seats running along central where the road authority and traffic police paid very little attention to fix. As your charging scheme is to charge people entering central. Once they are inside central, they will still continue the double parking and buses had to run those routes into central. Not only you are not fixing the issue, congestion will still continue whilst residents such as us suffers greatly financially and whereas there will be no improvements to the traffic conditions whatsoever. Furthermore, central is the key hub to international financial centre. The impression businesses are already encountering are the high living expenses, office rentals and if traffic costs are increasing, we are not creating sufficient competitiveness to our city. Furthermore, the price charged for Western tunnel needs to be fixed. The majority of the congestion came from the exorbitant charges of \$60 for private cars whereas \$20 for Hung Hom cross harbor tunnel. By lowering the fees of the Western tunnel would resolve a lot of the traffic jams in central area and not jammed from central to Wanchai.</p>	2016-01-07 08:44:39
W00140	729	<p>本人剛發表意見，本人所有資料請保密。</p>	2016-01-06 22:52:38
W00139	728	<p>Commenter wants to keep the comment unpublished 意見人不願公開意見</p>	2016-01-06 22:48:32

W00138

727	<p>我要求居住於上環的居民可獲得豁免。</p> <p>本人居住於上環皇后街，返工位置為九龍灣，每日需經中環、金鐘、紅磡（或東區，視乎交通情況而定）返工放工，對於我這類原有居民每日必須經過這些路段的人，在沒有替代免費線路，又或者替代線路兩時太長的情況下，是極度不公平，相關路段擁擠塞車原因多元化，而原居民在無法豁免的情況下被迫使用這些路段，並不是造成相關道路擁擠的主因，所以向我們這些原居民征費是不合理、不公平。</p>	2016-01-08 18:17:22
726	<p>首先，本身我是一名駕駛者，公司在中環，平時亦會駕駛回公司，在ERP這個項目上，我有幾點意見如下：</p> <p>1) 香港的塞車問題是否真係那麼嚴重呢？無論，香港中環繁忙時間塞車一定比較多(如果有朝一日中環沒有塞車，好像現時假日一樣行車通順的話，我相信香港已淪陷了)，但相比起其他國家地區主要城市的情況還比較好的，如吉隆坡，塞車情況可以係多小時只行800米的路。</p> <p>2) 其實香港人是很聰明的，香港人生活節奏很快，如繁忙時間在繁忙的地區，你覺得他們會乘搭地鐵還是堅持駕駛去塞車去浪費時間？正如我和我的朋友一樣，就算駕車上班，也會早一點，避免了很多塞車才入中環；如果下班時會到網羅灣地區食晚飯，一定搭地鐵。我想講的是，基本上，時間成本已經成為一個無形的ERP，從經濟學角度看，現時的情況和ERP相比，ERP只是把道路的使用權，由時間成本低的人轉移到金錢上能負擔得比較高的人上，這是否政府想把公共資源傾向有錢人？再者，現時已有這無形的ERP，政府是否真需要動用公帑去建立ERP系統呢？</p> <p>3) ERP真的能減少中環的塞車嗎？正如我上面所講的，中環一帶是比較多塞的，你覺得一個有正常思維的人會毫無原因之下於繁忙時間駕車入中環塞車嗎？駕車入中環的，一定有他們的駕車的原因，如是者，除非ERP的定價是高昂的令普通人難以付出的（如每天港幣五百元），否則，根本要駕車入中環的始終會駕車，而且，很多在中環的塞是“老細塞”，他們有的是金錢，ERP, will they care?</p> <p>4) 當然，行駛車輛的數目多，塞車會比較嚴重，但政府有否派人研究過其他導致塞車的原因呢？就我的經驗所見，很多的堵塞主要是巴士上落客時間長，而後面又有巴士到車站後慢站造成堵塞，這些情況真的不罕見，很多時過了巴士站位就路路暢通，政府有否應先想方法去改善呢？又例如，中環德輔道中和鬧區的橫街(甚至雲咸街，皇后大道中(都爹利街至蘭蘭街)路邊經常有私家車或貨車停泊導致上落客貨，霸佔一條行車線，如果沒有這些停泊的車輛，行車相信會比較暢順。</p> <p>5) 另外，若果政府覺得ERP於技術方面已成熟，是否應先投放該等技術於各收費隧道和公路？這樣反而真的幫助駕駛人士減少在路面的時間。若果政府真的強行推出ERP，而收費隧道和公路仍然收舊有的Autotoll和收費亭的話，我會覺得很可笑。</p>	2016-01-08 15:45:40
725	<p>I just did your quiz to test my knowledge. It is extremely mis-leading in the 'avg. growth of the licenced vehicle fleet' question. Of course Hong Kong registered (only) vehicles have only grown by 3% per annum. That is not th e problem at all. The problem is vehicles registered in Mainland China who are allowed to drive here for whatever reason. I would like to see how many of those vehicles have received the reciprocal right to drive in HK since 2003. However, I bet NO ONE HAS ACCURATE STATISTICS OR CAN EVEN PRODUCE THIS NUMBER.</p>	2016-01-08 08:35:46
724	<p>The government acts as though it is not able to control the 7-seater van problem in Central, on Hong Kong Island in general, and in the congested parts of Kowloon. However, anyone- a group of housewives, a tourist, a businessman- ANYONE can rent a 7-seater van from a private company at the northern border for a very cheap price for the day or just a few hours. It's very cheap. These rented 7 seaters are then contracted to wait for their renters by double-parking, idling, and/or parking up to 1 metre from the curb in Hong Kong's most concentrated areas. They do nothing but take up space and stop the flow of traffic. Due to the huge numbers of these cheap vans, there are not enough police or traffic wardens to deal with the problem. Sometimes, the vans will not move under any circumstances unless they are personally directed by a police officer to do so. So it's no use talking about 'boss vans'. These are not boss vans. They are 'anyone' who has 1200 HKD vans.</p> <p>The government must take immediate steps to prohibit the rental of 7-seater vans and investigate the identity of these drivers (e.g. must be a HK resident). Going after the 7-seater vans is key.</p> <p>Additionally, traffic laws must be amended asap to increase the cost of double-parking, idling, and parking too far from the curb to huge fines. Traffic wardens must be empowered to issue tickets quickly and effectively. Just last night I was in CWB. I was heartened to see new traffic wardens issuing parking tickets to cars parked in a no-stopping zone. However, one car had a driver in it and was not issued a ticket. Why not? He was still sitting there after the wardens had ticketed every car. If the driver is in the car, and it is stopped illegally or parked immediately, HE MUST MOVE. Don't let him sit there. Even if he stays 20 minutes, this is the root of the problem.</p>	2016-01-08 08:31:40
723	<p>I lived in mid-levels and only used public transport as my mode of daily of travel with Central district being my main travel hub.</p> <p>I would like to express my viewpoints on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concession to certain vehicle category: like private public service license bus with their main passenger being private estates in mid-levels should be exempted from levy.</li> <li>2. Charging Scheme: I support to apply time/date sensitive scheme which depends on the congestion timing like 8:00-10:00/17:00-19:00(Mon-Fri), 8:00-14:00(Sat) being the peak demand for road.</li> </ol>	2016-01-05 22:38:17
722	<p>問題 6 你認為「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」應採用哪一個收費模式 - 對所有車輛劃一收費、根據車輛大小收取不同費用(即較大型的車輛需繳付較高的費用)或根據車輛的載客量收取不同費用(即載客量較高的車輛可付較低的費用)？</p> <p>應該根據車輛的載客量收取不同費用(即載客量較高的車輛可付較低的費用)。或可考慮公共交通工具不收費。</p>	2016-01-05 22:17:24

W00135

W00134

W00133



W00132

721	<p>本人並不贊成是次計劃。</p> <p>政府將車位問題歸咎於車多，這是一個不盡不實的結論。本人認為，現時道路不「暢通」的情況，某部分是出自於巴士停站上落客，根據本人觀察，部分巴士司機沒有善用巴士站的停車位置，使巴士車身阻礙了部分行車線。而且，很大部份巴士路線有重疊情況，直接加重了路面負荷。我認為香港的交通情況遠不及其他國家，如在港推行這項計劃，會使替代路線出現嚴重阻塞，同時不合理地加重駕駛人士負擔。但不如，嚴格執行P牌駕駛人士使用行車路線的規則，從而提升使用路面的效率。</p>		2016-01-05 19:15:14
720	<p>I'm a HK PR and have lived here for more than 8 years. Prior to moving to HK, I lived in Singapore for 7+ years and am very familiar with the ERP system. I think it's a great idea and an excellent tool for reducing urban congestion and encouraging people to use public transport, ride share or walk. It's also a necessary step towards reducing pollution and may help make HK air a bit more breathable. I'm surprised it hasn't been implemented sooner, as these sorts of user-pay models are often the only effective ways to change behavior. Doug.</p>		2016-01-04 15:43:00
719	<p>係唔係可以限制私家車出嚟時間，好返電子道路收費呢？電子道路收費只要你有錢就可以任意出嚟但限制咁嘅同，係可以一刀切咗7成車輛(私家車)。</p>		2016-01-02 22:40:16
718	<p>你好，本人絕對贊成解決交通道路堵塞問題，因我亦係一個交通堵塞受害者！</p> <p>但道路電子收費並不是一個長遠計劃，本人希望提供以下的建議供參考：</p> <p>1 大部份的新界車輛也運到市區，因此令到某些商業地區交通負荷加重，本人住在錦田，在錦田路西鐵站有一個大型停車場但很可惜是一層的！我到過日本地方，看見他們的城市轉乘交通工具十分方便，因停車場在附近的鐵路線停車場是多層，如果在上水大埔或元朗及錦田停車場可以臨時加建多一層以上，我相信交通方面會解決一些問題。</p> <p>2 中環行館是我們的金融中心，金融中心代表區內的商業大廈有很多高級職員甚至乎老闆及人士，我相信只係一個短途電子道路收費他們不會在乎，司機仍然可以停泊在某一街道上等老闆，令到其他人是無法使用，我建議將某些街道列為特別區，而在某些地區區內，如果有司機停車不動交通警務員或交通警員可以給他們一張定額罰款例如 \$ 500 甚至乎 \$ 1000，如果在兩小時內車輛仍然不催，又或者車輛仍然留咁該區來，警員可以用拖車拖走他的車，我相信大部份老闆級都唔想見到他們有車用，如果行司機停咗車係一啲道路上，老闆只要打電話給司機，司機可以係十至15分鐘內就人到海區去接老闆，因道路暢通了！</p>		2016-01-02 13:26:16
717	<p>敬啟者，</p> <p>本人反對設立電子道路收費系統。本人深信此等系統是一種耗民及不必要的設施。本人相信香港特區政府應專注改善道路網絡及增加各區泊車設施。</p> <p>駕車者都會自行取道暢通的道路，增加泊車設施以減了停泊在路面的違例泊車，使路面更加暢通。</p> <p>此致</p> <p>何振賢</p>		2016-01-01 21:02:04
716	<p>反對, 意見如下:</p> <p>1 老關意而家基本上任抄 佢地唔 care 你抄佢地牌, 又點會 care 少少路費? 可以畀下銀行街壘</p> <p>2 未起好繞道之前, 此舉會令更加少人行西區, 減低西區分流的效果, 令到紅磡更塞</p> <p>3 影響貨車行業司機的生計, 減少他們的收入</p>		2015-12-30 13:46:34
715	<p>Taxi's should be allowed on De Voux Road (the restricted area), that would likely lesson up the traffic on Queens Road</p>		2015-12-30 10:53:25

W00131

W00130

W00129

W00128

W00127

W00126

W00125

714	<p>absolutely not! this is insanely unfair to the public... there are those that lives in Sai Kung, Tung Chung, Yung Long &amp; etc whom hardly ever needs to drive to Central District, and there are those LIVE in Central District, and there are those whom need to pass through Central District to return home...</p> <p>let's take someone who lives in Robinson Road for instance, currently he/she probably passes thru Central half the time to reach any destination, with ERP, he/she may divert to the road/s without charge, thus increasing road congestion around the area...</p> <p>Unless... and this will take alot of manpower and resource to achieve... ERP are exempted to vehicle whose addresses are registered in the ERP district... then you'll have issues with everyone faking their addresses...</p> <p>Alternatively: 1. double (or triple) the illegal parking fines in the proposed ERP district 2. 0 exemptions, make the entire Queen's Road Central (from No. 1 to 70) pick-up or drop off only 3. More transport/police officers roaming the ERP area and have them enforce the no-parking zone</p>	2015-12-30 10:50:52
-----	---	------------------------

W00124

713	<p>對電子道路收費的意見: 中環區塞車主要是無時無刻都有很多車停泊在路邊, 巴士和小巴上落客, 私家車等候, 貨車落貨, 導致少左一條行車路線, 就算設電子道路收費, 都會令減少車輛佔用馬路, 收費權人與停車等候是兩回事.</p> <p>本人認為設電子道路收費是不全面, 應該配合於中環區加派交通督察員, 禁止停車等候, 也可以設立上落時間, 如早上8點前或晚上9點後.</p> <p>請問政府於過往5年, 有多少交通督察員中環區巡邏? 數量有否增加?</p> <p>對擴充定額開飲的意見: 香港飲重塞車係因為停車場和咪位不足, 尤其是繁忙區如油尖旺和銅鑼灣, 加上食肆提供代客泊車, 長期霸佔路邊, 導致少左一條行車路線.</p> <p>請問政府於過往5年, 有否增加咪位數量? 增加多少? 有多少交通督察員巡邏? 數量有否增加?</p> <p>憲劍基 Got, Chong Key</p> <p>HKID: My mobile: Email:</p>	2015-12-30 09:51:08
-----	--	------------------------

W00123

712	<p>本人現居於青洲, 由於灣仔碼頭在中環, 假如需要購買大型家具或者傢俬都需要貨車搬運, 若果政府實行電子道路收費, 當貨車進入中環, 勢必將收費轉到本人身上, 除了貨品船費外, 還要額外比多一份車費, 請問對本人公平嗎? 會否將灣仔碼頭拆走.</p>	2015-12-29 17:00:16
-----	---	------------------------

## 收費區

問1 你對於如何劃設「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費區界線有何意見？原因為何？

A: 金鐘及上環亦應納入計劃內。在平日週一至週五繁忙時間(8:30AM左右)，往香港方向的車輛基本上堵塞了金鐘干諾道(從金鐘力質中心，一直至中環、上環，甚至很多時一直到西區海濱階道內)，設定進入金鐘或上環須收費是必要的，收費水平或中環會否收費更高為進一步的考慮。

問2 你認為鄰近中環的其他地區，如金鐘或上環的部分地方，是否應納入「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」內？如同意，應包括哪些地區？

A: 金鐘及上環亦應納入計劃內。在平日週一至週五繁忙時間(8:30AM左右)，往香港方向的車輛基本上堵塞了金鐘干諾道(從金鐘力質中心，一直至中環、上環，甚至很多時一直到西區海濱階道內)，設定進入金鐘或上環須收費是必要的，收費水平或中環會否收費更高為進一步的考慮。

## 收費機制

問3 你認為「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」應採用區域為本收費機制，還是圍界為本收費機制？原因為何？

A: 應採用區域為本收費機制。以圍界為本收費機制有太大誘因促使駕駛人仕停留車輛於收費區內，作無目的慢駛等候，甚至滯留。香港地少人多，不宜以圍界為本。

## 收費時段

問4 你是否認同「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」須在收費區交通流量高的時段內收費？

A: 認同交通流量高的時段內收費，用者自付原則，解決交通擠塞問題。

問5 你是否認同「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」不須在星期日及公眾假期收費？你對於收費時段有何其他意見？

A: 應該按實際擠塞程度收費，以歷史數據為依據，統計出擠塞的時段，在該些時段收費。

## 收費水平

問6 你認為「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」應採用哪個收費模式 - 對所有車輛同一收費、根據車輛大小收取不同費用(即較大型的車輛需繳付較高的費用)或根據車輛的乘客量收取不同費用(即乘客量較高的車輛可付較低的費用)？

A: 為鼓勵市民使用公共交通工具，以及巴士等交通工具在運輸處發牌規則中已能有效收費及控制公交流量，所有行走指定路線的公共交通工具應免收費，因為難以監察車輛的實際載客情況，其他車輛應根據車輛大小收取不同費用(即較大型的車輛需繳付較高的費用)。

問7 你認為電子道路收費應定於哪個水平(甲)假如是按日收費，或(乙)假如是按每次駛經收費(即每次經過收費點均收費一次)，才能令駕駛者改變其駕駛行為？

A: 按每次駛經收費，減低駕駛人仕停留車輛於收費區內，作無目的慢駛等候，甚至滯留的誘因。

## 豁免及優惠

問8 除緊急車輛外，你是否支持「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」向其他類型的車輛提供豁免/優惠？如果同意，哪些類型的車輛應獲豁免/優惠？原因為何？

A: 為鼓勵市民使用公共交通工具，以及巴士等交通工具在運輸處發牌規則中已能有效收費及控制公交流量，所有行走指定路線的公共交通工具應免收費。

科技

問9 遠距離微波通訊科技需要每部車輛在進入收費區的安裝  
店內裝置以繳付電子道路收費，而自動車辨識科技則需  
要在車輛每次駛過/駛離收費區或在收費區內道路行駛  
時拍攝其車牌，整體而言，你認為「中國電子道路收費先  
導計劃」應較適合採用遠距離微波通訊科技，還是自動車  
牌識別科技？

A: 沒意見

對私隱的關注

問10 你對「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的私隱保護有關注嗎？  
你的關注是甚麼？你認為這些關注應如何解決？

A: 對「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的私隱保護沒有關注

成效

問11 你認為在評估「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的成效時，  
應該採用甚麼指標？

A: 車輛行車速度、沒有速度、道路使用效率、溢流線存在。

問12 你是否同意「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費水平需  
要定期檢討，並在有需要時作出調整，以維持其成效？

A: 同意定期檢討，檢討車輛行車速度，速度越慢便增加收費，可根據不同時段的統計實際數據，調整不同時段的價格，可往上亦可往下。

配套措施

問13 你對「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」所需的配套措施有何  
建議？

在收費區外(如西九3號幹線沿線)的道路指示牌上，安裝顯示屏標示現時段進入收費區的收費，及預估通過收費區所需的時間，使駕駛者決定進入收費區前，有足夠資訊作出權性的改道選擇。

意見人:

CHAN TSZ FUNG

Email:

Mobile:

W00121

710 I would like to express my view on the electronic road pricing (erp) systems. I believe most of the traffic in the central area of Hong Kong during peak hours are caused by upper class people, commercial vehicles, taxis and other public transportation (bus and mini van). Erp would not affect the upper-class as they will remain having their driver to drive them to the central district, as for the commercial vehicles, erp would incur extra cost for delivery of goods and it will transfer these costs to consumers. Same for taxi and other public transportation.

2015-12-29  
14:37:30

W00120

709 本人是西半山居民，反對推行電子道路收費先導計劃

2015-12-29  
00:56:27

W00119

708 我絕對支持這項電子道路收費，上下短時間實在太多私家車，除了中環，將軍澳隧道也要實施。

2015-12-28  
21:40:46

W00118

707 I strongly disagree with the ERP Pilot Scheme. The government should conduct thorough studies on the fundamental reasons of traffic jams and focus on solving the root problems. The Scheme would not solve the core problems but instead add burden onto shoulders of vehicle owners and drivers.

2015-12-28  
21:38:29

W00117

706	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>This sounds totally ridiculous to me, having stayed in mid-levels for 40 years. Central and Admiralty are places that I must pass by daily, in order to get to work and going back home. This is not fair to have residents to pay (although you mention there are consideration on special rates)for traffic congestion problem because it is not US, to cause such matter.</p> <p>Why would traffic congestion happened in Central and Admiralty, 老細意 is one of the main problem. Paying HK140 a day and they could still do what they have been doing now is useless. Too many buses in these two areas are also a main cause. We do not need that much buses/taxis since lots of them are overlapping routes and not fully effective at all. Besides, the drastic increase on number of cars in HK also aggregates the matter. There are multi-ways to tackle with such, instead having the innocent parties to pay for the problem, which are not caused by them indeed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Limit the growth of car/taxi license through increase the first registration fee</li> <li>2) Ensure the police is actually 秉斷執法 in Central, they are ABSOLUTELY NOT NOW</li> <li>3) Whoever accumulated 15 points violations could not buy car in years</li> <li>4) If really needs to put in action, time should be limited to 0900-1700, not starting earlier than that</li> <li>5) If really needs to put in action, not only limit to Central, Admiralty and Wanchai. All congested area should apply, such as TST and Mongkok</li> </ol> <p>There are several ways much better and effective than this "idea" as this is nothing new but copying UK and Singapore. For them, there are lots of different routes to a venue due to its enormous size, but in HK, Central and Admiralty could be the only pathway to the destination. How could such "idea" being placed in HK?</p> <p>Whoever suggested it should have a clearer mind and think of something really fit in HK, not just being a copy-cat.</p> <p>Feel free to call me if you have doubts. I could actually write 10 pages on this stupid move.</p> <p>From AN ANGRY MID-LEVEL CITIZEN Mr IP</p>		2015-12-27 23:43:42
705	<p>Question 1: 不同區中區電子收費，收費不會令人減少進入中環，traffic jam 是因為大量巴士進入和車輛亂停泊車輛為主，有沒有想辦法改善，如之前提及的沒有改善，道路收費多少錢也不會改善。</p> <p>Question 2: 沒兩臺</p>		2015-12-27 23:32:21
704	<p>The plan only effect the poorer as the rich will not be effected.</p> <p>Central should be pedestrianised. Trams and buses only.</p>		2015-12-27 15:17:15
703	<p>I am pro ERP hk as that will solve most of the congestion problems in Central area. UK, Singapore all very successful with ERP. I support it!</p>		2015-12-28 19:33:41
702	<p>我先生是從車運輪業，每天都要到維多利亞港等地方 我覺得，如果在中環區增設電子收費會令“打工仔”增加負擔 一些“打工仔”可能月入只有一萬多小小， 誠懇懇，如電子收費為十元，該名司機我假設每天用二十元繳費，一個月已經用了六百元，還未計維修和其他什項。 雖然，增設電子收費或者可能可以舒緩堵塞情況， 但應該也要為打工仔籌想</p>		2015-12-28 01:50:00

W00116

W00115

W00114

W00113

W00112

701	<p>Before sharing my view on those specific questions, my general view towards the ERP Pilot scheme is negative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently the new Bypass is still under construction and there is no other alternative for drivers to pick.</li> <li>2. If the ERP scheme is expected to launch after the Bypass is available, I think the government can have more time to check the new average speed within Central district. I am sure for those who are not stopping in Central will pick to use the Bypass as it should be faster and more convenient. If the bypass is a success, the ERP scheme can be withdrew.</li> <li>3. Even the Bypass if not a success (ie. the traffic is much lesser than expected and traffic jam condition has no significant improvement in Central district), the government should find ways to encourage drivers to use the new Bypass.</li> <li>4. Another reason for the traffic jam is a lot drivers waiting their bosses in Central. Obviously they do not dare to have \$10 ERP fee charge. And I could say the police did not do a good job to issue tickets to drivers and even those waiting drivers are asked to leave by the police, those drivers will just driving slowly in and out to wait for their boss. HK\$10 or even HK\$20 per round trip is nothing for those bosses, but it hurt some other drivers who may have other reason to go to Central. I would suggest to have some more police to issue tickets in the Central area.</li> <li>5. I think the ERP could have some effect to improve the traffic as it will discourage a lot drivers to go to the district. It seems the outcome is helping bosses to have a more pleasant driving.</li> <li>6. I would suggest the government offices to move out from Central-Admiralty area. This may solve a lot issue too.</li> </ol> <p>Other suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently some drivers are taking the West Harbor Tunnel to HK district even though the toll fee is much higher than other tunnels. To encourage drivers to use the West Harbor Tunnel, I would suggest to have the ERP free for 1 hour after crossing the harbor from Kowloon side by the West Harbor Tunnel as well as ERP free for taking West Harbor Tunnel from HK side. I think this may improve the traffic of the Hung Hom Tunnel issue too.</li> <li>2. the ERP scheme could be launched after the Bypass is available and not effective to solve traffic issue in Central.</li> </ol> <p>Thanks.</p>	2015-12-24 10:12:22
-----	---	------------------------

W00111

700	I think it is possible to adopt this policy,because it can solve the air pollution efficiently.Also,it won't be too crowded during the peak period.Hong Kong,which is a high-technology city,should adopt the high-technology policy	2015-12-23 21:16:12
-----	--	------------------------

W00110

699	贊成！	2015-12-23 20:07:19
-----	-----	------------------------

W00109

698	<p>I am a life-long resident in Hong Kong Island. Currently I live on Robinson Road and go to work to my office on Connaught Road Central. Everyday, I take public transportation to go to work and go home after work. I DO NOT agree to the ERP Scheme and suggest the Government should stop spending more time or resources in this matter. There are plenty more urgent and important challenges for the Government to deal with and to keep Secretary Anthony Cheung busy than this ERP Scheme.</p> <p>The traffic issue on Hong Kong Island is NOT particularly serious, and traffic jam is but a tolerable phenomenon. Yes, there is traffic jams during mostly rush hours, but this is part of the vibrant Hong Kong lifestyle especially in the CBD area. It is no big deal to build that in the planned traffic time and that is fine. No need to expense so much effort and resources in a small nuisance like this.</p> <p>Further, as the new alternative roadways and viaducts soon to come into commission, vehicles may easily find alternative routes to go around Central when they are completed. Let people exercise their free choice and better judgement in choosing roadways, and the problem will be alleviated.</p> <p>If the Government wants to be proactive in helping to ease the traffic in and around Central, it should limit the access of trucks and delivery vehicles into Central during peak hours. Oftentimes, it is these vehicles parking and loading/unloading illegally that have clogged up traffics in major access ways. Another thing the Government may work on is to work with licensed buses to consolidate their routes so that these huge vehicles would not block kilometer-long of lanes of roadways without end.</p> <p>The ERP Scheme is to try to punish private vehicles going into and around Central. Let me again declare that I DO NOT DRIVE to work, and so even if the ERP Scheme is on, it won't affect me. Yet, do bear in mind that most likely those private vehicles driven into Central are mostly owned by people who can easily afford a nominal amount to pay for the ERP, meaning that your ERP Scheme won't reduce much the number of private vehicles. If you want to deal with the problem, do work on the trucks, delivery vehicles as well as buses.</p> <p>Anthony Cheung should have a lot other more important agenda on hand than selling this ERP Scheme to the public: the fiasco that involved multiple project delays and budget overrun by MTRC; the HK-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge; the Airport expansion project; housing supplies, etc., just to name but a few. Don't get distracted by this low-priority ERP Scheme while there are many more urgent challenges at hand.</p> <p>There are plenty more policy initiatives that should command a higher priority on the Government agenda: Hong Kong's long term sustainable economic development; housing and land policy; education issues that would impact on the future of our younger generation; as well as healthcare policy that would become more urgent as our population is growing old fast. On any given day, there are much less people that would be impacted by the traffic jams in Central than the above mentioned challenges. Pursuing to implement this ERP Scheme is a misappropriation of policy priority.</p> <p>Hence, I am writing to request the Government to soon terminate any effort in pursuing this ERP Scheme once the consultation is over.</p> <p>My last name is _____ and I am contactable via _____ Please feel free to publish my comments for open viewing, but keep my personal info anonymous. Thanks.</p>	2015-12-23 17:33:03
-----	---	------------------------

W00108

697	<p>本人不建議政府推行電子道路收費，因不見到任何可改善交通情況，因為道路塞車常見是由幾個情況發生：1) 繁忙時間太多巴士攔站佔用大半行或2條以上車線，有的巴士路線份重疊或站同站距離太近 (如九龍灣地鐵站，地鐵站頭尾都有同號巴士線的站，腳程不到10 - 15MIN, 如296A/C 觀塘油池同轉彎後的觀塘碧翠，腳程不用5MIN)同金鐘/灣仔一樣，導致塞車去到中環。2) 太多司機在邊邊路口不遵守規則，如黃格等後導致塞住得理，應該在繁忙最塞路口有交警無檢控例可憐。3) 中港車特然增多4) 私家車增長太快，應控制私家車增長，劃車額勝比新車牌地有益區5) 司機違例泊車，在中環等老鬧的區，最重要方便，所以抄牌或收錢不足問題6) 有些地區停車場不足或收費過高，導致違泊好過。7) 新海路面不經塗不足，可會拖 P 牌不可繁忙時間行駛，減少意外同道路壓力8) 中環實施收費，中環位必在全體同灣仔，情況必定惡化9) 全面檢討路牌，道路劃線，及交通，如大老山隧道車道可提先到80KM, 可加快車流，加快車能消散。香港仔隧道如是，可減少紅燈壓力。有些道路規劃可檢討，可減少如車輛交匯或CUT 線時的意外。</p>		2015-12-23 15:46:34
698	<p>本人基本上是支持電子道路收費，不過以下幾點不認同</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) 星期六不需繳納人收費時段，因為好多中環上班人士大多星期六不用工作；</li> <li>(2) 該段收費道路亦程度影響港島西區居民，所以星期六海濱可以豁免；</li> <li>(3) 要解決道路堵塞可以大幅度增加私家車首次登記稅和交通違例款項；</li> <li>(4) 現時經常見到好多私家車/的士像中環違例泊車，警方要加強發票；</li> <li>(5) 政府首先要做好榜樣，多利用公共交通工具。</li> </ul>		2015-12-23 14:35:05
695	<p>有關繼續開徵徵餉前，先解決中環停車位短缺問題先講電子道路收費。 基本上全香港車位都短缺，有部份旺區停車場時租要 \$40 半小時，叫員叫人點有動機泊入去，可否用行政或徵稅迫使停車場降低收費，甚至免費，咁就會吸引車主人停車場。</p>		2015-12-23 14:20:58

W00107

W00106

W00105

W00104

W00103

W00102

W00101

W00100

W00099

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
694	<p>收費技術意見: 車牌位置有冇冇未必 detected到, 加埋autotoll用就 very good, 因為唔想再架多一審野。</p> <p>綜合和假單意見: 綜合和假單就 noway 喇, 任何車人得條路就佔用左道路, 所以所有車包括政府車, 警車, 救護車, 小巴同巴士都要比鐘, 錢大部就收得多D。</p> <p>問題: 例如老細車, 過D人左收費區俾條路等老細唔曉又點處理? 電子道路所收取的費用又會否用返條道路到? 例如會否用所收取的費用去提升修路次數同加快修路造道的技術? 而家喇馬路東一忽西一忽, 行過好"野"。</p> <p>個人意見: 最後我係反對電子道路收費, 因為而家個政府太廢做嘢都唔結, 加上我地D車主又年年比牌費而家又加多條收費, 咁就緊係反對!</p>		2015-12-23 12:39:25
693	<p>你好,</p> <p>本人在英國生活已經十年, 當中4年多時間生活在倫敦, 倫敦係電子道路收費既先導城市, 我可以肯定同你講做個計劃對舒緩交通係毫無幫助! 係倫敦道路設計已包括ring road去舒緩道路使用者由城市既一面去第二面, 不過任何時間市中心都係保持交通堵塞, 可想而知, 做個計劃只會增加政府既收入, 而唔會就導交通, 而且, 大部分時間中環既道路都係比公共交通工具occupied, 所以重組巴士路線同班次時間先係上策。</p> <p>請不要再再為道路使用者開刀。</p> <p>Henry Wong</p>		2015-12-22 22:46:50
692	<p>本人極之唔讚成有關計劃, 港島堵塞, 原因如下</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 車輛逐漸泊滿, 3條線變1條線, 原因是沒有足夠的停車場可選擇, 中環現在只得2個停車場, 集中係大會堂附近, 根本唔可能滿足所有司機, 你可以話附近商場都冇, 點解仲可以講無, 但如果你咁講, 嚟相宜啲勾結, 加速商場收費增加。</li> <li>2. 隧道收費問題, 喇司機集中係巴士打道, 係因為紅隧收費跟其他隧道收費相距十分大, 建議政府收購所有隧道橫一收費。</li> </ol>		2015-12-22 22:46:53
691	I strongly disagree to execute ERP pilot scheme in central. Majority of the car owners are still willing to pay money to drive into central. Traffic jam will remain but just a way for government to earn extra money.		2015-12-22 22:26:40
690	ERP is a big white elephant. Will it charge for at least \$200 to enter the Central ?? Of course, it will not. If is not to charge a high price enough to force people using taxi, it is useless. It is not possible to achieve a success. Just wait to see.		2015-12-22 22:20:19
689	<p>I object the ERP at all.</p> <p>This will cause lost business for firms in Central.</p> <p>The rich can afford but not the middle class owning a car.</p> <p>The running cost is high and not bring benefit to the tax payers.</p> <p>It is wasting the time of Hong Kong people.</p> <p>Why not adopt the quota system like Peking.</p> <p>It is really another act of causing disappointment to Hong Kong people.</p> <p>Finally, it will create another big big argument among Hong Kong people.</p>		2015-12-22 22:16:55
688	I like ERP much.		2015-12-22 17:23:44



W00098

687	<p>1. 電子道路收費先導計劃 should not be implemented before 繞道 is available. The scheme should carefully evaluate the impact to the nearby residential area. There are many senior citizens living in the nearby area. They may be wheelchair-bound and thus will not be able to take public transportation. The scheme should not cause adverse impacts to the serene mid-levels residential area.</p> <p>2. 交通擠塞的元兇--違例泊車阻塞道路 along 65 Wyndham Street and 40 Queen's Road Central. 一條道路 was constantly blocked by illegal parking in these two problematic areas. Illegal parking should be punished right away, law enforcement should be tightened.</p>		2015-12-22 14:10:47
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00097

686	<p>I'm a daily driver which working in Central Region; as my living place doesn't have good support of public transportation and i need to drive daily to work.</p> <p>From my personal point of view and my daily driving observation, most of the traffic jams in Gloucester Road and central are actually caused by the public transportation, i.e. public bus. This is very common and can easily see this around the old wan chai police station. More than 20 buses queuing for load/unload of the passenger many times the bus occupied more than two lanes on Gloucester Road.</p> <p>In addition, many cars are waiting to pickup in Central which caused blockage.</p> <p>Both of the issues above actually are not able to be solved by ERP; and this actually need police enforcement and optimize of the bus route rather than introduce ERP which harder the life of the citizen which is not a "BOS S".</p> <p>Also, the lack of affordable car park in most of the regions also contributed to the traffic jam. Transport Department seems always under estimated the need of car park required; and government only have plan to demolish the government car park (which is more affordable to user) to build commercial building, e.g. Rumsey Street Car Park, Murray Road Car Park. Is this how government trying to solve the problem ?</p>		2015-12-21 15:02:15
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00096

685	<p>支持電子道路收費上環至銅鑼灣, 可減少塞車。 而家太多私家車日日早上及黃昏工作, 嚴重塞車, 港島大擠迫! 我試過多次一小時半及二小時返回家!!無命!! 希望盡快上環至銅鑼灣安裝上電子道路收費。 善終!</p>		2015-12-21 14:05:16
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00095

684	絕對支持，因交通阻塞問題，令時間極難控制！		2015-12-21 12:38:28
-----	-----------------------	--	------------------------

W00094

683	The one important observation in London regarding the congestion charge scheme is although the traffic has slightly improved with the scheme, it has actually worsen in some cases along the Ring Road, which is the border of the congestion charge area.		2015-12-20 22:33:48
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00093

682	<p>敬啟者: 本人覺得電子道路收費是不可行, 第一所有市民有權使用道路, 不是給有錢比的人家用, 第二是香港駕車到中環至銅鑼灣大多是老開車有錢人, 他們不會有問題, 只會影響大眾市民, 第三收費後其他人轉去不收費路段會引至塞車影響地區居民, 所以是不可行只會造成分化有錢同無錢人地位, 香港是沒有必要做, 分單雙號車牌行走也沒用, 因為大多數老開有錢人一定有幾部車對他們也影響不大, 只會影響窮苦大眾!</p>		2015-12-20 22:08:12
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00092

681	<p>Traffic congestion in Central mainly due to two reasons.</p> <p>1. Illegal parking and off loading - this can be rectified by enforcing traffic and parking control strictly. Traffic wardens, police with towing facility can do more. Off loading to department stores or shops should be done between 7:00pm to 8:00am to avoid blocking the traffic during rush hours.</p> <p>2. Too many buses - there are more than necessary huge buses running through Central. Routes and interval of buses running through Central during rush hours should be streamlined to make way for public.</p> <p>ERP is a costly scheme and would not improve traffic congestion because chauffeurs will still wait for their bosses, deliveries to stores, huge buses still run whether they have to pay entering the congestion zone or not.</p> <p>I am against the ERP scheme. So take action as in 1 &amp; 2 above before spending taxpayers' valuable money on ERP scheme.</p>		2015-12-20 10:53:06
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00091

680	電子道路收費, 只會當做成本, 例如現在抄牌也當做治塞車, 除卻電子道路收費很貴, 令民生反應很大才見效, 這是貴冑社會生活的事。		2015-12-20 00:14:12
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00090

679	電子道路收費, 在3個月諮詢期後, 仍要做可行性研究, 能否成功落實半信半疑。		2015-12-20 00:11:43
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00089

678	<p>代價出價的邵先生對電子道路收費計劃多餘，他說當前的目的是，不會因為電子收費而不前往，該指收費對有錢的高級根本無影響，對中產人士則影響較大，至於「牛肉乾」大幅加價，邵先生指核心問題是停車場及泊位不足，加價應增加車場收入。</p> <p>駕駛客黃志的曾先生稱，不贊成電子道路收費計劃，並應只向私家車收費，營業的「蘭食車」則應豁免泊車後收費，又指出黃志曾舉行無法離開目的地的，曾先生今日則被抄牌，他指普水橋系因中環一帶停車場不足才被逼封閉，認為加車罰款無濟於事。</p> <p>任職銀行的邵先生表示，電子道路收費計劃無助解決塞車問題，因目的地往往無法離開，至於「牛肉乾」大幅加價，他則認為罰款金額多年無調整，幅度加價，但今次加幅太高，職業司機黃先生則認為電子道路收費計劃可改善交通堵塞，但重視乎收費水平，對於「牛肉乾」大幅加價，他批評部分司機稱自己承擔罰款，加車罰款並非好事。</p>	2015-12-20 00:08:35
-----	--	---------------------

W00088

677	<p>電子道路收費罰中下階層 職業司機神無得靈</p> <p><a href="http://hk.on.cc/hk/bkn/ont/news/20151211/bkn-20151211193927308-1211_00822_001.html?eventsection=hk_news&amp;eventid=402882b1515d0ea401518fe599360d73">http://hk.on.cc/hk/bkn/ont/news/20151211/bkn-20151211193927308-1211_00822_001.html?eventsection=hk_news&amp;eventid=402882b1515d0ea401518fe599360d73</a></p>	2015-12-20 00:08:23
-----	--	---------------------

W00087

676	<p>新华网新加坡 12月10日电 (记者包露琳)“在没有堵车的情况下，从A地到B地和从B地到A地的打车费为什么相差很多？是不是司机绕路了？”一些来新加坡旅游的朋友可能会发出这样的疑问。</p> <p>一般情况下，两地往返打车费用的差异是因为车辆经过电子收费闸门的收费有变动，这与新加坡通过电子道路收费系统（ERP）疏导繁忙路段车流的做法有关。</p> <p>新加坡是全球第一个采用电子道路收费系统的国家，其电子道路收费系统于1998年投入使用，由此实行的区域通行费制度演变而来，电子道路收费系统旨在通过收费鼓励人们选择替代方案出行，以减少高峰时段市区繁忙路段的车流，进而缓解道路拥堵状况。</p> <p>电子道路收费系统由电子收费闸门、带现金卡的车载单元和中央控制系统三部分构成，电子收费闸门遍布新加坡各大高速公路和主干道上，据新加坡陆路交通管理局（简称陆交局）最新的统计简报，截至2014年，新加坡共有电子收费闸门77个。</p> <p>当安装带现金卡车载单元的汽车经过电子闸门时，闸门上的传感器收到感应信号，车载单元发出“哔”声，卡内金额自动扣除，只要现金卡内有足够的储值，车主无须停车，缴费自动完成，如果卡内金额不足，或者车辆经过闸门时卡没有插好，车辆信息会被记录下来，罚单随后会寄到车主手中。</p> <p>新加坡电子道路收费系统的收费并非“一刀切”，而是根据不同车型、不同日期、不同时段及道路拥挤状况的变化而调整，收费在0.5新元至5新元（1新元约合4.6元人民币）之间不等，陆交局每3个月都会对电子道路收费系统进行评估，适时做出调整，此外，每年6月和12月学校放假期间，道路收费价格会相应下调，民众可在ONEMOTORING网站上查询每个电子收费闸门的收费时段和收费标准。</p> <p>以安装在最繁华的旅游景点乌节路上的一个电子收费闸门为例，通过该闸门的车辆按汽车/轻型货车/出租车、摩托车、重型货车/小型巴士、超重型货车/大巴的分类收费，同一类型车辆工作日和周末收费标准不同，每天不同时段也不同。</p> <p>数据显示，电子道路收费系统使新加坡市中心车流减少了大约13%，高峰时段平均车速提高了20%，新加坡陆交局在报告中说，在汽车保有量逐年增加的情况下，新加坡市中心的交通连续多年保持较为通畅的情况，2014年10月，《联合早报》在一篇社论中指出：“ERP收费机制已表现出更大的灵活性，这是在激励和惩罚之间寻求平衡点的积极做法。”</p> <p>但是，随着电子收费闸门增多，一些新加坡民众也表示出不满，指责ERP是“过高的道路收费”、“每天都抢劫民众”，有的车辆为了绕过电子收费闸门，不得不行驶更长的距离，这也会造成能源浪费，增加行车时间。</p> <p>目前，新加坡陆交局通过招标开发新一代无闸门电子道路收费系统，新系统将采用全球导航卫星系统监测车辆位置，可根据个别车辆在拥堵路段行驶的实际路程向车主收费，以使收费更加科学合理。</p>	2015-12-20 00:00:59
-----	--	---------------------

W00086

675	<p>新华网新加坡12月10日电(记者包露琳)“在没有堵车的情况下,从A地到B地和从B地到A地的打车费为什么相差很多?是不是司机绕路了?”一些来新加坡旅游的朋友可能会发出这样的疑问。</p> <p>一般情况下,两地往返打车费用的差异是因为车辆经过电子收费闸门的收费有变动,这与新加坡通过电子道路收费系统(ERP)疏导繁忙路段车流的做法有关。</p> <p>新加坡是全球第一个采用电子道路收费系统的国家,其电子道路收费系统于1998年投入使用,由此前实行的区域通行券制度演变而来,电子道路收费系统旨在通过收费鼓励人们选择替代方案出行,以减少高峰时段市区繁忙路段的车流,进而缓解道路拥堵状况。</p> <p>电子道路收费系统由电子收费闸门、带现金卡的车载单元和中央控制系统三部分构成,电子收费闸门遍布新加坡各大高速公路和主干道上,据新加坡陆路交通管理局(简称陆交局)最新的统计简报,截至2014年,新加坡共有电子收费闸门77个。</p> <p>当安装带现金卡车载单元的汽车经过电子闸门时,闸门上的传感器收到感应信号,车载单元发出“哔”声,卡内金额自动扣除,只要现金卡内有足够的储值,车主无须停车,缴费自动完成,如果卡内金额不足,或者车辆经过闸门时卡没有插好,车辆信息会被记录下来,罚单随后会寄到车主手中。</p> <p>新加坡电子道路收费系统的收费并非“一刀切”,而是根据不同车型、不同日期、不同时段及道路拥挤状况的变化而调整,收费在0.5新元至5新元(1新元约合4.6元人民币)之间不等,陆交局每3个月都会对电子道路收费系统进行评估,适时做出调整,此外,每年6月和12月学校放假期间,道路收费价格会相应下调,民众可在ONE.MOTORING网站上查询每个电子收费闸门的收费时段和收费标准。</p> <p>以安装在最繁华的旅游购物街乌节路上的一个电子收费闸门为例,通过该闸门的车辆按汽车/轻型货车/出租车、摩托车、重型货车/小型巴士、超重型货车/大巴的分类收费,同一类型车辆工作日和周末收费标准不同,每天不同时段也不同。</p> <p>数据显示,电子道路收费系统使新加坡市中心车流量减少了大约13%,高峰时段平均车速提高了20%。新加坡陆交局在报告中说,在汽车保有量逐年增加的情况下,新加坡市中心的交通连续多年保持较为通畅的情况。2014年10月,《联合早报》在一篇社论中指出:“ERP收费机制已展现出更大的灵活性,这是在激励和惩罚之间寻求平衡点的积极做法。”</p> <p>但是,随着电子收费闸门增多,一些新加坡民众也表出不满,指责ERP是“过高的道路收费”、“每天都抢钱民众”,有的车辆为了绕过电子收费闸门,不得不行驶更长的距离,这会造成能源浪费,增加行车时间。</p> <p>目前,新加坡陆交局通过招标开发新一代无闸门电子道路收费系统,新系统将采用全球导航卫星系统监测车辆位置,可根据个别车辆在拥堵路段行驶的实际路程向车主收费,以便收费更加科学合理。</p>	2015-12-20 00:00:52
674	<p>政府今日宣布就中環及其鄰近地區電子道路收費先導計劃,展開為期3個月的公眾諮詢,政府將會就收費機制、時段、收費水平及方法聽取公眾意見,並進行相關可行性研究,運輸及房屋局局長張炳良表示,香港道路交通擠塞問題日益嚴重,過去十年道路上行車速度普遍有減慢趨勢,部分主要道路如德輔道西、渣打道更在繁忙時段更慢至每小時約10公里,僅比成年人步行速度略快,他指交通擠塞除會影響香港整體的運輸性及舒適性之外,亦會對經濟及空氣質素帶來惡影響。</p> <p>政府表示現時新加坡、美國倫敦等地已實施電子道路收費,而交通流量亦明顯減少,認為相關收費計畫基於用者自付原則,希望透過收費調節道路使用量,從而改善相關地區交通擠塞情況。</p>	2015-12-19 23:56:37
673	<p>只要車量不減少,收費有何意義,這樣</p>	2015-12-19 20:17:23
672	<p>請關於收費範圍內居住的市民,是否可以獲得豁免或寬減?</p>	2015-12-19 20:16:35
671	<p>你好 本人反對電子道路收費,我住在中環區, 避免不了經常進入中環區, 如果道路需要收費, 這樣對住在該區的居民十分不公平, 而且此道路的費用, 都由稅收得來的, 我相信著在中環區大部分都是納稅人, 無理由要納稅人, 付錢進道路後, 再向他們收費, 政府這個行為根本是不公平, 而且收費根本不是解決方法, 2尺運輸署應該用更積極有效的方法去解決塞車問題, 例如在繁忙時間增加人手抄牌, 因為解決方法是運輸署及政府需要面對及解決, 如何有效地解決, 你們應該作出一個更好的方法, 而不是只向市民收費, 如果這個方法是有效早在幾十年前就已經通過!本人不明白為什麼過了那麼多年後還是想著用同一個方法解決?? 社會不擁則退政府部門用高薪聘職員, 不是應該有更好的方法解決嗎? 為什麼是用以前的方法呢? 而且收費根本解決不了問題, 所以本人是極力反對的, 希望政府能夠想出一個更有效的方法 不要再做無能的政府</p>	2015-12-19 13:31:32

W00085

W00084

W00083

W00082





W00076

		* % \$ ! ~ < > /		
	065	見議按時間收費，例如：三千六百cc以下車輛進入中環區後以每分鐘六毫收費，防止車輛在中環區內兜圈阻礙流量，如按每次進入收費對一些經常在該區內活動車來說是完全沒起到阻礙作用，其他車輛如貨車、大型車，只要收取比小型車為高的費用即可，如區內有車位的車主只要在停車場出入口加裝計時器，進入車場即停止計時，離開車場即可。		2015-12-17 17:02:08
	064	實施時，巴士、小巴及電單車應予以豁免，因為它們並非導致塞車的原因 私家車則可收費		2015-12-17 10:17:50
	063	本人收費應以時間為主，本人住中西區居民，其實最最嚴重的地方是干諾道中、皇后大道中、環環街，如果私家車停留不超過15分鐘不用收費，貨車停留不用收費，貨車停留不超過三十分鐘不用收費，收費後應重新轉道中，可減少車輛使用皇后大道中，增加車流量，但希望有場仔細完成後才有進一步的探討		2015-12-17 09:51:16
	062	反對實施電子道路收費。 1. 最終不能解決塞車問題，只是將塞車地點遷移到中區收費區外圍。 外圍塞車，想進入收費區的車輛也一起塞在外面。 2. 亦無道逼某些地區只希望有錢人，付得起錢才能進入，這就預明闊佬、富貴人仕，要窮人讓出空間方便有錢人有更快的通道。 3. 中國塞車很大原因是太多老開車在金融中心或置地廣場/新世界大廈一帶停車等候，還有貨車落貨，的士停車排隊等候，令原本狹窄的道路只能慢慢行車。 要解決塞車問題應將該地設劃為朝7至晚7禁區，嚴厲執法另非法停車等候問題解決，將多次非法停車等候的車輛拖走扣留，另道路暢通才是正確方向，本人在中國生活多年，不論大街小巷，美國與否都見到車輛停泊，另原本多條行車變成一條行車，這樣不塞車才怪。		2015-12-17 09:49:57

W00075

W00074

W00073

W00072

661

#### Are Congestion Zones a Good Idea?

First of all, what are congestion zones? Congestion zones are a designated zone in which vehicles are charged a fixed rate to travel through at peak times. In Central London, if vehicles travel between 7.00am and 6.30pm, they are charged. The idea of congestion charges are meant to help reduce pollution by speeding up journey and encouraging people to drive at night or use public transport. However, some may argue that this is not the case. In this essay I will be discussing the advantages, disadvantages, social effects, economical effects and the environmental effects of congestion zones. I will be analysing a piece of data to justify my opinion and I will also state my sources throughout. At the end of this essay, I will be judging the reliability of the sources.

#### Benefits of Congestion Zones:

The congestion zones were initially made to help with traffic that causes pollution on the busy roads of London. The public were encouraged to use public transport as opposed to driving to their destination, therefore; reducing the amount of traffic on the roads. Since the congestion zones have been put in place, there has been a 6% increase in bus passengers during charging hours (source 1). Also, the money raised during charging times has been invested in improving public transport in London (source 1). In 2004, the former mayor of London (Ken Livingston) released a statement saying that traffic had been cut by 18% and delays were down 30% (source 2). Also, he says that there has been a significant cut in CO2 emissions; as it was cut by 15% (source 2). The number of cars entering the congestion zone has dropped by 38% which means that 40000 less people are driving through the zone each day (source 6)

#### Problems with Congestion Zones:

Many argue that there negative effects of congestion zones for the city and its inhabitants. The argument that is most frequently used is that it will hit the poor and not the rich. People who have money often do not care about congestion charges whereas those with less money must watch every penny they spend (source 3). Furthermore, because the congestion zone is in the busiest part of London where there are a lot of stores, shoppers must pay an extra fee if they want to visit it (source 4). Some also say that instead of reducing pollution, a congestion zone can do the opposite; a driver can drive numerous miles through the congestion zone and pay the fee but, as it is cheaper, the same drive may use an alternate route that the congestion zone but may be much longer. Thus, the vehicle uses up more gas, creating more pollution (source 4). In addition, average speeds in the congestion zones have risen significantly. Average speeds have risen from 3mph to 7.4mph. The highest speed was 9.8mph and the slowest speed was 5mph (source 6). This could lead to more car accidents.

Hybrid cars are exempt from the congestion zone charges as they create less pollution. This was meant to encourage the public to buy hybrid cars, however; this in itself is a disadvantage. This is because hybrid cars are more expensive than a regular petrol car. Also, because the battery engine is virtually silent, some drivers feel disconcerted as the car sounds like it is out out. The lack of noise also is criticised by road safety who say it can inadvertently lead to a rise in car accidents. Hybrid cars are also less powerful than standard petrol cars of a similar size. (Source 5)

#### Social Effects of Congestion Zones:

##### Environmental Effects of Congestion Zones:

One of the main aims for the congestion zones was to lower the CO2 emissions. However, some researchers have found the introduction of congestion zones has had no effect on the level of smog and noxious gases. As a matter of fact, some pollutants rose when the charge was enforced as extra buses and taxis were put on the road (source 7). Though it reduced traffic in the Central London area by 40,000 vehicles a day, there was a huge increase in the number of buses (source 7). However, some may argue that the Congestion Zones may encourage more people to walk, cycle or take the bus which will reduce the number of cars on the road which in theory should reduce pollution (source 8)

##### Economical Effects of Congestion Zones:

As Congestion Zones reduce traffic levels, the roads are faster to travel on as they are de-clogged. This can result in a higher number of people who can reach the city within a given amount of time. These de-clogged roads can help the economy by more information and stock being able to be exchanged which can lead to a higher rate of innovation. The congestion charges can makes approximately 137 million in 2007/08. This is more than 17% of London's annual bus takings.

Although this is only a proportion of London's overall public transport budget, investing in alternatives to cars could help to reduce harmful gas emissions. By investing in new public transport, it provides an opportunity for many unemployed people to get jobs. (Source 8)

Data showing the levels of nitrogen oxides by the road before and after the introduction of zones:

2015-12-16  
23:28:27

Before:  
Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday Saturday Sunday  
Levels of  
nitrogen oxides  
in  
micrograms/m3

47 49 42 39 41 38 35

After:  
Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday Saturday Sunday  
Levels of  
nitrogen oxides  
in  
micrograms/m3

45 40 42 39 36 40 38

I have used these tables to further process them into a line graph which is easier to evaluate. It is apparent from this graph that there is not much difference between nitrogen oxide emissions from before the congestion zones and after they were put in place. In fact, on Wednesday and Thursday the levels were the same and on Sunday the levels were higher after the congestion zones. Although there was a small change of nitrogen oxides being emitted, in that the levels lowered slightly after the congestion zones on some days, there was not the dramatic change that was expected by the general public. So overall, the nitrogen oxide polluting the air was reduced by an extremely minute proportion and not dramatically.

Reliability of my sources:

In regards to my sources, I believe that sources 1 and 2 are the most reliable as they are both government-run websites that will inevitably have precise and accurate figures and information. Also, source 8 is extremely reliable as it is also a government-run website. In my opinion, sources 3, 5 and 7 are somewhat reliable as they all show facts and figures but may not be as reliable as the government-run websites because the creator of the website writes the information and we are not given the sources of where this information came from. Also, they could exaggerate the information in order to get their point across. However, it is likely that the creator of these websites is an expert in these fields because otherwise they would not have made a website in order to give false information to the users. The least reliable source would be source 4 as it is a website that can be updated by anybody and edited in any way to fit the author's opinion.

In conclusion, I believe that Congestion Zones are not a good idea because overall, studies have shown that it makes little or no difference to the environment. In fact, some say it will result in the air becoming even more polluted due to the increase in public transport. Also, the costs of congestion charges are not helpful for anybody because we have now just come out of a recession and everybody needs to watch every penny that they spend. The government claim to be using the money made from congestion charges to improve public transport, yet I have not seen a dramatic difference in the quality of buses or trains.

Appendix:

- # Source 1: <http://www.tfl.gov.uk/roadusers/congestioncharging/6723.aspx>
- # Source 2: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/3494015.stm>
- # Source 3: <http://www.fatih.edu.tr/~mcadams/geo567/projects/utsch.pdf>
- # Source 4: [http://www.ehow.com/info\\_8333978\\_congestion-zone-disadvantages.html](http://www.ehow.com/info_8333978_congestion-zone-disadvantages.html)
- # Source 5: <http://www.preventclimatechange.co.uk/hybrid-vehicles.html>
- # Source 6: Are congestion zones a good idea? – Worksheet.
- # Source 7: <http://www.nowpublic.com/environment/congestion-charge-has-had-no-effectreducing-londons-pollution-finds-study>
- # Source 8: <http://www.centreforcities.org/assets/files/Congestion%20Charging.pdf>



W00071

660

香港的交通網絡越來越繁忙，即使政府正考慮一些新幹道應付不斷增加的車流，但交通擠塞的情況似乎未見改善。上星期五，已經討論幾十年的電子道路收費系統，終於再被政府放在枱面，進行3個月的公眾諮詢程序，看看在中環一帶進行稀七晚八的道路收費，坊間會下如何。

討論多年的電子道路收費系統，用意就是舒緩繁忙地區的交通擠塞情況，所以政府這次看中環區，可說是眾望所歸，不少打工仔可能心感「我又無意，唔關我事嗎！」但又其實未必完全無關。

這個雖然是先導計劃，以中環為一個試點推行，但若這個試點推行的成效不容，政府自然會在其他地區實施，尤其是一些人流車流密集的市區主要街道，相信會是重點地區，而這種限制車流的動作，即使對於非車主的人士沒有直接影響，但如果閣下所在區域推行這種收費系統，如果搭的士、Call Uber，他們所以支付的收費，自然會變成閣下的開支，尤其以Uber或者GoGoVan這類共享經濟模式下的載物，他們雖以自稱為公共交通工具，所以幾乎可以肯定這類服務的收費會計入這些金額。

至於乘坐公共交通工具的人士，亦同樣地會受到影響，現在的討論之中，尚未確定巴士、小巴之類的公共交通工具，是否可獲豁免，一旦要收費，對巴士公司或者小巴營運商而言，自然是加價或者在特定時間徵收額外車費的理由；至於港鐵雖然一定不會受到這個系統的影響，但乘客亦很大機會將會增加，即使港鐵不加價，對乘客來說，等多兩班車可能也不夠，提早15分鐘抵工吧。

中環雖然是金融區，但白天還是會得到不少的貨車駛經該區，甚至亦有些零售店的貨品是在白天運抵，這些自然也會受到將來的道路收費所影響，要運貨受到影響，可能零售商要兜路，以其他路線將貨件運到目的地，或者要在區外的位置上落貨，再運抵目的地，這些做法一方面會增加成本，同時在其他道路上落貨，亦可能會將現時交通擠塞的問題，改為令一些過往不常車的街道變成交通擠塞的焦點。

當然，零售商亦可以更改上落貨時間，例如在晚八後和天光之前，但無可避免會改變部分公司的運作，亦可能牽涉新的人手調配和薪金支出等，這幾項的成本增加，都很可能會轉嫁到消費者身上。

同樣地，倉庫系統影響的位置，舖租也自然會更加受到影響，若未來一些民生區域也設有道路收費系統，由於這類區域有更多上落貨等的關注，租客遷轉自然要更留意，對這類地區的舖位價格和租金，影響相信亦會更大。

就以上幾個簡單例子說明，即使是車主與否，電子道路收費系統並非只關車主事，不妨在明年3月18日之前，仔細研究一下這個公眾諮詢計劃政府的建議，以免日後政府真正推行的話，受到影響而趕不及提出關注。

2015-12-16 23:17:57

W00070

669

首先我們是反對電子道路收費，有了這項收費並不代表真正可以改善交通擠塞，真正要改善交通擠塞的方法 增加 道路，例如東區走廊 以減少美區道的擠塞 減少私家車增長，舉例 如果這一條是你回家必經之路，你會否因電子道路收費，需要繳費 因此不回家? 這樣變相 強迫民黨 增加稅收 變成了 富貴人專區，張炳良局長 月薪20萬 他不坐地鐵的 還有外國的經驗 並不代表適用於香港，增加汽車首次登記稅 壓抑 私家車 增長 這可以考慮

2015-12-16 17:25:30

W00069

668

The below document contains photo evidence as to why I believe automatic number plate recognition cannot work as a means to ERP :  
[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BwkE-\\_TusVekXzg0NURVdnhLaTA/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BwkE-_TusVekXzg0NURVdnhLaTA/view?usp=sharing)

Ever since the 1st PVRM auction in 2006, numerous PVRM displays can be seen to violate 374E sched.4. And probably due to the very visible violation, some TVRM holders also tamper with the display/font in order to achieve certain visual effects. As the Commissioner of TD mentioned in the press that automatic number plate recognition is likely to be use for charging vehicles entering Central, this can become further incentives for PVRM/TVR M owners to tamper with the display in a way that may defect the recognition system. As can be seen in my submitted google-drive document, vehicle with PVRM '3SG' displayed as '358' can drive into Central ERP area, and the charge could be incorrectly levied to vehicle with TVRM '358'.

In conclusion,if TD is to proceed with ERP using automatic number plate recognition, then TD MUST immediately enforce Road Traffic Regulation 374E sched.4, and TD should also penalize PVRM owners using illegal display. And for those repeated offender, TD should withdraw the PVRM from use.

2015-12-16 16:31:18

W00068

667

反對實施電子道路收費計劃，如欲有效地限制車輛使用特定的路段，應實施在特定時間，限制特定的車輛類別駛入特定的路段，例如於星期一至星期五的早上七時至早上十時及下午四時至七時限制私家車駛入特定的路段，而違規進入者，最高可被判處罰款2千元及監禁3年。

馮先生

如有任何疑問，歡迎致電與本人聯絡，電話

2015-12-16 15:16:10

W00067

656	<p>本人對電子道路收費計劃有以下意見:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) 電子道路收費應以車輛的登記人為單位, 無論登記人有多少車輛, 登記人名下只可有一輛車登記豁免收費.</li><li>2) 電子道路收費應用於辦理車輛維修或辦理車輛過戶手續時一併繳交;</li><li>3) 由於有在職人士於公眾假期的日子仍需上班工作, 所以只安排豁免公眾假期時收費的做法並不公平, 為了使市民於自己的休息日無意到該區避過而又同樣可享有豁免使用道路收費, 應定為每名車輛的登記人每月可享有八次的豁免使用收費道路的收費, 而豁免收費的次數是可以累積的, 為了防止有人濫用累積的豁免收費的次數, 累積豁免收費的次數會於辦理車輛過戶手續後被取消.</li><li>4) 而為減少市民經常駕車上班, 收費應每月以累積計算, 以收阻嚇作用.</li></ol> <p>例子: 於一個月使用十二次</p> <p>第一次至第八次可獲豁免收費, 第九次使用收費為港幣100元, 第十次使用收費為港幣200元, 第十一次使用收費為港幣300元, 第十二次使用收費為港幣400元, 即合共港幣1,000元.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5) 由於有部份富裕人士能夠承擔道路收費, 故單靠收費未能起有效阻嚇作用, 故需同時加入記分制度.</li></ol> <p>記分例子: 於一個月使用十二次</p> <p>第一次至第八次可獲豁免記分, 第九次使用會被記0.5分, 第十次使用會被記0.5分, 第十一次使用會被記0.5分, 第十二次使用會被記0.5分, 即合共記兩分.</p> <p>馮先生</p> <p>如有任何疑問, 歡迎致電與本人聯絡, 電話</p>		2015-12-16 14:59:18
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00066

655

收費區:

問1 你對於如何劃設「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費區界線有何意見?原因為何?

繞道入口之後應有一可供拆返的緩衝區域,其後一律為收費區,如駕駛人仕繼續深入該緩衝區域,即視為進入收費區域,稱繳交路費。

問2 你認為鄰近中環的其他地區,如金鐘或上環的部分地方,是否應納入「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」內?如同意,應包括哪些地區?

同意,應在交通擠塞黑點路段相對擴大訂立收費區域的核心,建議以繞道兩端出入口以內的市區皆應納入以讓駕駛人仕能盡早下決定是否進入收費區,以免駕駛人仕臨到收費區邊緣停車折返構成混亂。

收費機制

問3 你認為「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」應採用區域為本收費機制,還是車界為本收費機制?原因為何?

應以車界為本,因每次進入都會佔用路面空間,以進入次數作為收費更能配合用者自付原則,並且增加人佔用時間因素來加收懲罰性附加費用以達到阻滯效果,減少停滯區內車輛數目,採用區域為本模式會吸引某些人仕滯留或多次往返,令計劃效果打折扣。

收費時段

問4 你是否認同「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」須在收費區交通量高的時段內收費?

應採取全日徵費,只是在某些低流量時段豁免上述「停留附加費」以減少車輛流動性影響居民。

問5 你是否認同「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」不須在星期日和公眾假期收費?你對於收費時段有何其他意見?

應採取全日徵費,只是在假日豁免上述「停留附加費」以減少車輛流動性影響居民。

收費水平

問6 你認為「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」應採用哪一個收費模式-對所有車輛劃一收費,根據車輛大小收取不同費用(即較大型的車輛需繳付較高的費用)或根據車輛的載客量收取不同費用(即載客量較高的車輛可付較低的費用)?

根據車輛大小收取不同費用(即較大型的車輛需繳付較高的費用)以反映道路資源消耗,另外針對私家車訂立高收費。

問7 你認為電子道路收費應定於哪一個水平[(甲)擬如是按日收費;或(乙)擬如是按每次駛經收費(即每次經過收費點均收費一次)],才能令駕駛者改變其駕駛行為?

應採用漸次收費,並加入停留時間增加「停留附加費」。

豁免及優惠

問8 除緊急車輛外,你是否支持「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」向其他類型的車輛提供豁免/優惠?如果同意,哪些類型的車輛應獲豁免/優惠?原因為何?

單車獲豁免

區內居民車輛亦應予折扣及豁免停留附加費,如採用零排放機動車輛可獲豁免零排放的機動車輛可予以折扣

科技

問9 短距離微波通訊科技需要每部車輛在進入收費區的實際車內裝置以繳付電子道路收費,而自動車牌識別科技則需要在車輛每次駛進/駛離收費區或在收費區內道路行駛時拍攝其車牌,整體而言,你認為「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」應較適合採用短距離微波通訊科技,還是自動車牌識別科技?

混合使用,短距離微波通訊科技為先,自動車牌識別科技為輔。

對私隱的關注

問10 你對「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的私隱保護有關注嗎?你的關注是甚麼?你認為應如何關注如何解決?

在現今科技之下私隱已近乎零,既然難以避免,唯有善用,對於公眾疑慮,搜集資料應以車輛為主,駕駛人員的個人資料則不應太容易獲取(例如稱執法機關申請法庭命令以配合違法車輛調查)

成效

問11 你認為在評估「中區電子道路收費先導計劃」的成效時,應該採用甚麼指標?

2015-12-16  
14:44:38

		車輛流動性(平均車速)及空氣質素 問12 你是否同意「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」的收費水平需要定期檢討，並在有需要時作出調整，以維持其成效？ 同意，計劃初期應每季檢討，三至五年後改為每半年檢討。 配套措施 問13 你對「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」所稱的配套措施有何建議？ 收費區域內路面應塗上不同顏色，繞道前應有醒目提示以提醒收費區		
W00065	654	收費時段早上7時至晚上8:30 中上環一帶，要有警察禁止違法泊車，皇后大道中德輔道及干諾道打道 常見可憐等老婦、所有出入中上環的車輛都要收費，尤其是私家車和巴士佔據了大部分的路面更加要收費，十次惠濟訪車及警車可以不收費或者若有工作許可的團體公司煤氣修爐也不用，收費要有阻嚇性由30至50！便到行必要就不要到中上環或坐地鐵！		2015-12-16 12:30:08
W00064	653	本人對電子道路收費計劃有以下意見： 1) 電子道路收費應以車輛的登記人為單位，無論登記人有多少車輛，登記人名下只可為其中一輛車登記豁免收費。 2) 電子道路收費應用於路邊車輛避讓或避讓車輛過戶手續時一併繳交。 3) 由於有在職人士於公眾假期的日子仍需上班工作，所以只安排豁免公眾假期時收費的做法並不公平，為了使市民於自己的休息日駕車到該區避過而又同樣可享有豁免使用道路收費，應定為每名車輛的登記人每月可享有八次的豁免使用收費道路的收費，而豁免收費的次數是可以累積的，為了防止有人濫用累積的豁免收費的次數，累積豁免收費的次數會於避讓車輛過戶手續後被取消。 4) 而為減市民經常駕車上班，收費應每月以累積計算，以收阻嚇作用。 例子：於一個月使用十二次 每月的第一次至第八次可獲豁免收費，第九次使用收費為港幣100元，第十次使用收費為港幣200元，第十一次使用收費為港幣300元，第十二次使用收費為港幣400元，即合共港幣1,000元。 5) 由於有部份富裕人士能夠承擔道路收費，故單靠收費未能起有效阻嚇作用，故需同時加入記分制度。 記分例子：於一個月使用十二次 每月的第一次至第八次可獲豁免記分，第九次使用會被記0.5分，第十次使用會被記0.5分，第十一次使用會被記0.5分，第十二次使用會被記0.5分，即合共記兩分。 馮先生 如有任何疑問，歡迎致電與本人聯絡，電話		2015-12-16 00:07:10
W00063	652	本人對電子道路收費計劃有以下意見： 1) 由於有部份富裕人士能夠承擔道路收費，故單靠收費未能起有效阻嚇作用，為公平起見，應使用記分制度，電子道路收費應改為電子道路記分制度，即像例駕駛記分制度，以車輛的登記人為單位，無論登記人有多少車輛，登記人只可為其名下其中一輛車登記豁免每月八次使用電子道路的記分。 2) 由於有部份在職人士於公眾假期的日子仍需上班工作，所以只安排豁免公眾假期時記分的做法並不公平，為了使市民於自己的休息日駕車到該區避過而又同樣可享有豁免記分，應定為每名車輛的登記人每月可享有八次的豁免記分，而豁免記分的次數是不可以累積的，為了防止有人濫用豁免記分的次數，豁免記分的次數會於避讓車輛過戶手續後被取消。 記分例子：於一個月使用十二次 每月的第一次至第八次可獲豁免記分，第九次使用會被記0.5分，第十次使用會被記0.5分，第十一次使用會被記0.5分，第十二次使用會被記0.5分，即合共記兩分。 馮先生 如有任何疑問，歡迎致電與本人聯絡，電話		2015-12-16 00:03:47

W00062

851

Myth 1: Congestion charging is unnecessary  
London has the worst traffic congestion in Britain. There is just too much traffic on our roads - and not just in central London. Without firm action forecasts are for 300,000 more cars on London's roads by 2016 and our road traffic crisis is set to continue. Polls routinely show that Londoners, visitor and businesses say there is too much road traffic and that traffic levels affect people's quality of life and damage London's image.  
Most people (over 70 per cent) entering central London for work or leisure use public transport so the percentage of people coming in by car is quite small. But those that do still cause enormous and unnecessary problems, congestion being just one of these, for everyone else. Because most trips in London are for relatively short distances about 1 in 5 car journeys terminating in the charging area could transfer to public transport, and many others to walking and cycling. Congestion charging will help people change their travel habits and extend real transport choice. People with a car will be able to leave it at home for many of their trips. The large number of Londoners in households without a car (37 per cent) will be able to travel without feeling like second class citizens.

Myth 2: it's anti-car  
It is too easy to condemn as 'anti-car' any measure, however small, that seeks to control the way cars have come to dictate our lives. Congestion charging won't stop all cars coming in - it will ease congestion for those that need to. People with a disabled 'blue badge', taxis and licensed mini cabs, and drivers of dual fuel gas or zero pollution vehicles, will be zero-rated and can drive in the congestion charge zone for free.

Myth 3: other measures could be used instead  
Congestion charging alone will not solve London's traffic and transport problems but it is a start. People need other measures such as Company Travel Plans, Safe Routes to School (to deal with the 'school-run' - 18 per cent of the morning rush hour), coordination of road works, and far better cycle facilities and bus, train and tube services. These measures are needed as well as congestion charging, which can have an immediate effect.

Myth 4: it's a regressive tax hitting the poor, not the rich  
Not true. Few low-paid workers drive into central London. The poor are less likely to drive in London than elsewhere. A UK Family Expenditure Survey shows that car ownership among the poorest 10% of Londoners is just 18%, compared to 25% nationally. Most of the money raised (about £130 million a year) will go to improve the public transport system, helping all Londoners but especially the poorest who most rely on public transport and who tend not to have a car. A 2002 report by the Friends of the Earth

26-28 Underwood Street London N1 7JQ  
Information Service 0808 800 1111 Fax 020 7460 0881 Email info@foe.co.uk Website www.foe.co.uk  
Friends of the Earth Limited Registered in London No 1012357  
Printed on paper made from 100% post-consumer waste  
Friends of the Earth inspires solutions to environmental problems which make life better for people  
Friends of the Earth is:  
\$ a unique network of campaigning local groups, working in over 200 communities throughout England, Wales and Northern Ireland  
\$  
\$ the UK's most influential, national, environmental campaigning organisation  
the most effective environmental network in the world, with almost one million supporters across five continents

2015-12-15  
23:23:02

and over 60 national organisations worldwide

\$ Dependent upon individuals for over 60 per cent of its income

To join or make a donation call us on 0800 581 051

Institute of Public Policy Research found links between levels of poverty and increased road deaths, especially children; reducing road traffic levels is even more urgently needed for poorer Londoners.

Myth 5: it won't work (too complex/too cheap/zone too small/too many illegal cars/possibility of civil disobedience)

Let's try it and see. The technology has been used elsewhere (e.g. bus lane enforcement cameras) although not as one package on such a large scale. The inevitable teething problems must be ironed out not be used as an excuse to junk the scheme. The police are cracking down on the hazard of illegal cars which are a real cost to law-abiding drivers, and the congestion charge cameras will catch more. The system is designed to catch non-payers.

Myth 6: public transport won't be ready

Improvements have been made to public transport - especially the buses - and more is in the pipeline. Of course more improvements are needed but London cannot wait for every aspect of public transport to be perfected we adopt congestion charging as part of dealing with too much traffic. Revenue from the charge will help fund improvements.

Myth 7: businesses will be damaged by the charge

Congestion costs businesses at least £2 billion a year in lost staff time and delayed deliveries; there could be large economic savings in terms of more reliable journeys and reduced fuel consumption and energy waste with traffic sitting in jams with their engines running. This will help businesses large and small.

Myth 8: why should nurses/fire-fighters pay the charge?

They won't, if working. When on duty in marked vehicles they won't pay the charge and should be able to move around London faster. Most come to work, even at difficult times of the day or night, by public transport or bike. The solution for the minority who do not is not an exemption but better public transport and better pay.

Myth 9: recent traffic light changes are for congestion charging

Not true. The re-phasing of traffic lights began in 1992 to bring London's signals in line with national standards for pedestrian crossings. It is unreasonable to expect all Londoners to cross roads faster than someone in Leicester.

Myth 10: it won't even help air quality

The congestion charge is not primarily about improving air quality. A successful congestion charge scheme may reduce some air pollution from road traffic in central London, but not enough to meet the targets for clean air to protect people's health. For that, the charge is needed across a wider area along with the creation of Low Emission Zones across Greater London, preventing highly polluting vehicles from travelling within the M25.

Congestion is killing London.

Myth 1: Congestion charging is unnecessary

London has the worst traffic congestion in Britain. There is just too much traffic on our roads - and not just in central London. Without firm action forecasts are for 300,000 more cars on London's roads by 2016 and our road traffic crisis is set to continue. Polls routinely show that Londoners, visitors and businesses say there is too much road traffic and that traffic levels affect people's quality of life and damage London's image.

Most people (over 70 per cent) entering central London for work or leisure use public transport so the percentage of people coming in by car is quite small. But those that do still cause enormous and unnecessary problems, congestion being just one of these, for everyone else. Because most trips in London are for relatively short distances about 1 in 5 car journeys terminating in the charging area could transfer to public transport, and many others to walking and cycling. Congestion charging will help people change their travel habits and extend real transport choice. People with a car will be able to leave it at home for many of their trips. The large number of Londoners in households without a car (37 per cent) will be able to travel without feeling like second class citizens.

Myth 2: it's anti-car

It is too easy to condemn as 'anti-car' any measure, however small, that seeks to control the way cars have come to dictate our lives. Congestion charging won't stop all cars coming in - it will ease congestion for those that need to. People with a disabled 'blue badge', taxis and licensed mini cabs, and drivers of dual fuel gas or zero pollution vehicles, will be zero-rated and can drive in the congestion charge zone for free.

Myth 3: other measures could be used instead

Congestion charging alone will not solve London's traffic and transport problems but it is a start. People need other measures such as Company Travel Plans, Safe Routes to School (to deal with the 'school-run' - 18 per cent of the morning rush hour), coordination of road works, and far better cycle facilities and bus, train and tube services. These measures are needed as well as congestion charging, which can have an immediate effect.

Myth 4: it's a regressive tax hitting the poor, not the rich

Not true. Few low-paid workers drive into central London. The poor are less likely to drive in London than elsewhere. A UK Family Expenditure Survey shows that car ownership among the poorest 10% of Londoners is just 18%, compared to 25% nationally. Most of the money raised (about £130 million a year) will go to improve the public transport system, helping all Londoners but especially the poorest who most rely on public transport and who tend not to have a car. A 2002 report by the Friends of the Earth campaigning organisation the most effective environmental network in the world, with almost one million supporters across five continents and over 60 national organisations worldwide  
\$ Dependent upon individuals for over 90 per cent of its income

To join or make a donation call us on 0800 581 051  
Institute of Public Policy Research found links between levels of poverty and increased road deaths, especially children; reducing road traffic levels is even more urgently needed for poorer Londoners.

Myth 5: it won't work (too complex/too cheap/zone too small/too many illegal

W00061

650

2015-12-15  
23:22:42

cars/possibility of civil disobedience)  
Let's try it and see. The technology has been used elsewhere (e.g. bus lane enforcement cameras) although not as one package on such a large scale. The inevitable teething problems must be ironed out not be used as an excuse to junk the scheme. The police are cracking down on the hazard of illegal cars which are a real cost to law-abiding drivers, and the congestion charge cameras will catch more. The system is designed to catch non-payers.

Myth 6: public transport won't be ready

Improvements have been made to public transport - especially the buses - and more is in the pipeline. Of course more improvements are needed but London cannot wait for every aspect of public transport to be perfected we adopt congestion charging as part of dealing with too much traffic. Revenue from the charge will help fund improvements.

Myth 7: businesses will be damaged by the charge

Congestion costs businesses at least £2billion a year in lost staff time and delayed deliveries; there could be large economic savings in terms of more reliable journeys and reduced fuel consumption and energy waste with traffic sitting in jams with their engines running. This will help businesses large and small.

Myth 8: why should nurses/fire-fighters pay the charge?

They won't, if working. When on duty in marked vehicles they won't pay the charge and should be able to move around London faster. Most come to work, even at difficult times of the day or night, by public transport or bike. The solution for the minority who do not is not an exemption but better public transport and better pay.

Myth 9: recent traffic light changes are for congestion charging

Not true. The re-phasing of traffic lights began in 1992 to bring London's signals in line with national standards for pedestrian crossings. It is unreasonable to expect all Londoners to cross roads faster than someone in Leicester.

Myth 10: it won't even help air quality

The congestion charge is not primarily about improving air quality. A successful congestion charge scheme may reduce some air pollution from road traffic in central London, but not enough to meet the targets for clean air to protect people's health. For that, the charge is needed across a wider area along with the creation of Low Emission Zones across Greater London, preventing highly polluting vehicles from travelling within the M25.

Congestion is killing .

W00060

649

The congestion issue in Central is not due to the amount of traffic, but the illegal parking, stopping and waiting of taxi, private cars and delivery trucks.

The ERP system will only increase government revenue, and it will NOT solve the congestion problem.

2015-12-15  
19:17:48



W00059

646	<p>Congestion pricing in New York City was a proposed traffic congestion fee for vehicles traveling into or within the Manhattan central business district of New York City. The congestion pricing charge was one component of New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg's plan to improve the city's future environmental sustainability while planning for population growth, entitled PlaNYC 2030: A Greener, Greater New York.[1] If approved and implemented, it would have been the first such fee scheme enacted in the United States.[2] Nonetheless the proposal did not succeed as it was never put to a vote on the Assembly.</p>		2015-12-15 00:33:22
647	<p>The congestion charge will suck billion and billion from drivers in its first decade. However, the history and future will prove its failing to cut congestion.</p>		2015-12-15 00:32:36
646	<p>Implementation of congestion pricing has reduced congestion in urban areas, but has also sparked criticism and public discontent. Critics maintain that congestion pricing is not equitable, places an economic burden on neighboring communities, has a negative effect on retail businesses and on economic activity in general, and represents another tax levy. A survey of economic literature on the subject, however, finds that most economists agree that some form of road pricing to reduce congestion is economically viable, although there is disagreement on what form road pricing should take. Economists disagree over how to set tolls, how to cover common costs, what to do with any excess revenues, whether and how "losers" from tolling previously free roads should be compensated, and whether to privatize highways.[1] Also, concerns regarding fossil fuel supply and urban transport high emissions of greenhouse gases in the context of climate change have renewed interest in congestion pricing, as it is considered one of the demand-side mechanisms that may reduce oil consumption.[2][3][4][5]</p>		2015-12-15 00:31:00
645	<p>Congestion pricing or congestion charges is a system of surcharging users of public goods that are subject to congestion through excess demand such as higher peak charges for use of bus services, electricity, metros, railways, telephones, and road pricing to reduce traffic congestion; airlines and shipping companies may be charged higher fees for slots at airports and through canals at busy times. This pricing strategy regulates demand, making it possible to manage congestion without increasing supply. Market economics theory, which encompasses the congestion pricing concept, postulates that users will be forced to pay for the negative externalities they create, making them conscious of the costs they impose upon each other when consuming during the peak demand, and more aware of their impact on the environment. The application on urban roads is currently limited to a few cities, including London, Stockholm, Singapore, Milan, and Gothenburg, as well as a few smaller towns, such as Durham, England; Znojmo, Czech Republic; Riga, Latvia; and Valletta, Malta. Four general types of systems are in use: a cordon area around a city center, with charges for passing the cordon line; area wide congestion pricing, which charges for being inside an area; a city center toll ring, with toll collection surrounding the city; and corridor or single facility congestion pricing, where access to a lane or a facility is priced.</p>		2015-12-15 00:30:38

W00058

W00057

W00056

W00055

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
644	Strong support for cordon-based charging mechanism & limit exemption to only those emergency (not including government AM plate) vehicles and lowered charges for taxis. More frequent towing for those parked vehicles in violation of parking limits without prior warning		2015-12-14 16:38:07
643	因伤健人士行动不便，未能如一般人仕可在电子收费路段外围泊车，然後转乘公共交通工具进入收费路段，直接驾车到达目的地，对伤健驾驶者尤为重要。 故建议伤健人士驾驶者可获电子道路收费豁免。 此致。  夏明彪		2015-12-14 09:18:16
642	禁烟，到時所有路邊泊位關車停街，!!		2015-12-14 01:13:31

W00054

W00053

W00052

641

與時並進一步

2015-12-13  
21:50:34

W00051

640

唔講要收費，收費亦唔會令官職減少，行經車路大部份搵食意，你收費佢又要加費，惡性循環只會令人百上加斤！

2015-12-13  
21:15:51

W00050

收費區  
 Q1. 本人非常支持政府推行「中國電子道路收費先導計劃」，減少中環路面交通及污染，本人經常到訪中環附近，經常受路面空氣污染及交通擠塞的噪音滋擾，感到非常厭惡，巴士又時常脫班、擠迫及行車緩慢，結果需要轉坐地鐵。

Q2. 鄰近中環的其他地區，金鐘或上環的部分地方，都應加入收費計劃之內，包括夏慤道、金鐘道及新運的路和道。  
 另外，中半山地區亦有塞車路窄問題，故應該加入計劃，鼓勵市民善用半山扶手電梯，特別是部分駕駛人士或會繞經中半山道路，以避開主幹道收費，這將會加道中半山交通負荷，故此中半山道路亦應收費。

收費體制  
 Q3. 區域為本方式為佳，這可以減少中環區內的車輛數量，特別是在漫無目的地行駛的可憐，避免他們在區內無成本地行駛，應跟從哥倫堡例子，設置輕巧設備，及可利用現有的燈柱及高速公路燈柱放置。

收費時段  
 Q4. 收費先導計劃須在收費區交通量高的時段內收費。

Q5. 不認同不須在星期日和公眾假期收費，與國外不同，本港有高覆蓋及高效的公共交通系統，可以用交通工具外出，而且公眾假期及新年行車數量有一定數量，但可考慮修收費，使駕駛人士在區內行車有一定警覺。

收費水平  
 Q6. 對所有車輛劃一收費是最佳收費方式，因為計劃與離道收費不同，無人手收費，故此要確保車輛大小、載客量、車輛有否護欄有難度。

Q7.  
 (甲)如是按日收費，應該在40元附近，因為參考紅燈及百圓罰款，相當數目私家車便會轉往紅燈，同樣，本計劃下便會誘使司機轉至繞道。  
 (乙)假如是按每次駛經收費，則應在10元左右。

豁免及優惠  
 Q8. 緊急車輛外，政府車輛應按現時駛經行車隧道時的做法一致。

公共交通方面，可以考慮豁免摩多巴士及小巴收費，因為載容量高於一般車輛，減少車費加價壓力，鼓勵市民使用公共交通，對巴士或小巴收費或因而降低競爭力。  
 殘疾人士車輛亦不應豁免，由於本港地鐵、摩多巴士都已提供無障礙設施，而且覆蓋又非常廣泛，如須要，亦應只提供優惠，以達公平原則，最後，的士及貨車更不應提供優惠，現時擠塞路面上，亦有一部分為的士及貨車導致。

Q9. 對使用超超微波通訊科技為佳，更可以有別推展至其他隧道收費。

對私隱的關注  
 Q10. 關注如何拍影及事後如何處理相片，我認為應該在發現超超微波通訊科技失效或無維修時方啟動鏡頭，這樣拍下車輛。

成效  
 Q11. 成效應該以行車速度為重要指標。

Q12. 收費水平應定期檢討，並在有關時作出調整，首兩年應該一年一次檢討措施，其後要以公開的方程式計出加減幅度。

配套措施  
 Q13. 在開始計劃後，應緊密監察公共交通需要，行車速度上升或令班次過多。

其他意見  
 同時應請在技術細節準備妥當後，在處境在中環推行，同時，在先導計劃開始後，推展至其他地區，特別是有替代道路而又擠塞的地區，如灣仔、銅鑼灣地區（中環灣仔繞道）、旺角、發展中的九龍東面買區（中九龍幹線）。

2015-12-13  
16:48:20

W00049

638 不贊成！唔好成日諗點樣呢市民錢！錢d真辦法出黎啦唔該！

2015-12-13  
11:53:40

W00048

W00047

637	<p>親愛的政府官員，</p> <p>解決問題必需用有效的方法，不能為解決問題而製造另一問題。</p> <p>收費的目的是要改善中環單車，如收費實施後必須有另外收費道路供市民使用，如中環灣仔碼頭完成後中環單車問題可以舒緩，收費的意義不大，而且行政費用不菲，成效有待商榷，務請三思。</p> <p>本人要求把身分保密</p>	2015-12-13 09:14:42
636	<p>本人強烈反對任何電子道路收費計劃。香港政府在上世紀80年代已嘗試驗過，在1982年討論全面使用電子道路收費的可行性，1983年於中環進行試驗，結論是試驗失敗，不適合香港的情況，引起民間強烈反彈，計劃永久擱置。</p>	2015-12-12 23:31:53
	<p><a href="http://www.susdev.org.hk/susdevorg/archive2007/tc/irdoc/irdoc_5_2.htm">http://www.susdev.org.hk/susdevorg/archive2007/tc/irdoc/irdoc_5_2.htm</a></p> <p>道路收費</p> <p>引言</p> <p>5.2.1</p> <p>香港的道路和鐵路交通網絡是世界上最優秀的陸上公共運輸系統之一。市民每天都使用的士、集體運輸鐵路、公共巴士和電車上下班和處理日常事務。載人運貨也可以選擇使用私家車輛。這些高效率的交通系統確保我們可以有多元化的選擇。在種類和班次方面皆是。香港交通的另一個優勢是路徑較短；而且在目的地附近總可以找到地方上落，非常方便。</p> <p>5.2.2</p> <p>要保持這個優勢，我們必須有效地管理道路系統，並且確保保持交通暢通無阻。如果我們能做到這一點，除了可省去大量的時間外，還有一大好處，就是可改善路邊的空氣質素。路邊空氣污染由車輛和其他源頭造成，而道路兩旁林立的高樓大廈造成了「走廊效應」，令空氣質素惡化，更令塵埃和空氣污染積存，導致近身、中環和銅鑼灣等地區的空氣污染指數長期高企。</p> <p>5.2.3</p> <p>限制車輛進入這些地區，以免交通阻塞，有別於經驗問題。道路收費是香港可以考慮的一個交通流量管理措施，而這也可以是我們規劃未來交通需求時的一個重要因素。不少城市已開始採用道路收費措施，例如紐約已於2007年4月宣布引入道路收費計劃。</p> <p>5.2.4</p> <p>香港同時已就論證更多道路和高速公路對土地可能帶來的壓力和造成填海需要等問題進行了激烈的討論。</p> <p>道路收費的原則</p> <p>5.2.5</p> <p>道路收費是一個經濟工具，向駕駛人士收取使用道路的费用。在大多數情況下，這種收費形式是在收費亭付費，作為使用一段道路或一條通道，例如橋樑或隧道的代價。綜合國際經驗，道路收費所得款項主要用作道路或通道的維修管理費用，部分則用作應急儲備。收款方可以是政府或與政府合作的私人公司。港底隧道的收費就是香港現行道路收費的一個例子。</p> <p>5.2.6</p> <p>道路收費公認是減輕交通擁塞的方法之一，這個方法是根據用者自付的原則，為使用指定地區內的道路定出價格。駕駛人士可以考慮，繳付款項與進入該區，作為處理業務或娛樂的部分成本，是否化算。如果定價水平合適，不少駕駛人士會選擇不駛入該區，從而減輕擁塞情況。一般而言，道路收費是在不需要禁制交通的情況下另一類交通的選擇。</p>	

5.2.7

因此，在考慮實施道路收費時，必須顧及下列因素：

- 定價水平；
- 如使用者仍會使用車輛的話，如何記錄有關使用及收費；
- 如果駕駛人士不遵從有關規則時的罰則；
- 可選用的其他交通工具(例如公共交通工具)；以及
- 替代路線。

5.2.8

最後一點是非常重要的，特別是在香港而言：道路收費並不一定只用作減少交通流量，還可以用來分流整體交通；長遠而言，更可減少興建更多道路和高速公路。

5.2.9

在改善空氣質素方面，減輕交通擠塞定會減少在指定地區內車輛排放的污染物，從而令工作人員和居民的健康都得到裨益。一般而言，如果駕駛人士轉用更環保的交通工具，例如集體運輸鐵路、輕鐵、單車，甚至轉而步行，受限制道路四周的環境質素肯定會有所改善。進一步來說，把道路收費作為一個綜合運輸政策的一部分來實施，可以促進其他形式的公共交通工具(即鐵路和巴士)的發展，也可鼓勵市民採用其他環保的交通模式，例如泊車轉乘和步行。

5.2.10

道路收費機制可特別優惠環保車輛(例如使用歐盟IV型引擎的車輛或混合動力車輛)，從而鼓勵駕駛人士購買和使用這類車輛。

5.2.11

我們對兩個實施道路收費的城市－倫敦和新加坡－進行了個案研究。

新加坡

5.2.12

新加坡由1975年開始實施道路收費，系統初時以人手操作，其後於1998年由一個覆蓋市內主要商業區－商業中心區(下稱「禁區」)以及高速公路的電子公路收費系統取代。這個系統由陸上運輸局管理，使用的是一個過程偵測系統。車輛會繞上儲值帶，當駕駛者進入禁區並駛過了短程無線電偵測器的固定收費閘門時，偵測器便會作出記錄。系統會視乎車輛駛過該閘門的時間和閘門的位置，從儲值帶扣除0.25至3.00新加坡元不等，於繁忙時間內則必須繳費。

5.2.13

陸上運輸局發現，自從實施電子道路收費計劃後，在系統運作時間內，道路交通量有所降低，禁區內的車輛數目也減少了，更多人共用車輛，加速了禁區內的交通流量，並把繁忙時間的車輛交通分流至非繁忙時間，這道適應措施使用的效率得到改善。在過去數年，交通流量雖見增加，高速公路和主要道路的平均時速卻維持不變。

倫敦

5.2.14

倫敦交通擁擠費是對在倫敦中心地區內行車的駕駛人士所徵收的費用。這個地區位於倫敦內環路之內，包括倫敦市和倫敦西區，是倫敦的金融和商業娛樂區。交通擁擠費系統於2003年實施，由倫敦交通局管理。這個局由大倫敦政府成立，用以推行倫敦市長的交通策略。倫敦的系統與傳統的道路收費系統有異，前者採用一個自動車輛辨識系統，運用230部裝設在交通擁擠收費區邊界不同地點的閉路電視，隨機偵測進出該區的車輛。雖然是隨機操作，但倫敦交通局表示，大多數車輛都會偵測到並加以記錄。

5.2.15

收費時段由星期一至五，上午7時至下午6時30分。駕駛人士須預先繳費方可進入禁區。收取的費用與車輛號碼相符，而車輛號碼由閉路電視偵測。如進入禁區的車輛的車輛號碼與已繳費的號碼不符，系統會在48小時內向有關駕駛人士發出罰款通知單。進入禁區的費用是八英鎊，沒有繳費而進入禁區的罰款平均是100英鎊，而當局每月的發出十萬張罰款通知單。商用車隊可到倫敦交通局登記，被閉路電視偵測到的商用車隊車輛，每輛收費七英鎊。

5.2.16

這個系統並不是收支中和的，其目標是為倫敦交通局帶來收入，彌補這個系統和其他服務的營運開支。巴士、的士、緊急服務車輛、輕鐵車、單車和使用其他類型燃料的車輛均獲得豁免。

W00046

香港的情況

5.2.17

實施任何道路收費計劃必須考慮香港的特點。

實施地區

5.2.18

中環、銅鑼灣、灣仔、旺角和尖沙咀等地區是眾所周知的交通擠塞區。哪些地區最適合實施道路收費呢？最合適的收費結構是怎樣的呢？應按根據每日不同時段(但須設有豁免期，例如晚上，以便把貨車從日間繁忙時間分流)，還是根據道路使用量或駛入的地區計算？

5.2.19

香港有大量專利巴士、公共小巴和的士。這些交通工具的收費結構都具競爭力，同時都使用擠塞區內的道路。我們應否向這些交通工具收費？私家車輛又如何？

5.2.20

不少連鎖商店在交通擠塞區內經營，倚賴高效率的供應鏈和快捷的商業貨運服務。在道路收費計劃內，該如何處理這些貨運車輛？

5.2.21

部分擁擠地區的人士會有特定需要，例如前往診所的病人，以及緊急服務車輛。我們需要考慮為指定地區作出哪些豁免？

分級收費

5.2.22

這賦予向誰人收費和怎樣才是合適的收費結構這兩個考慮因素，我們能否藉著分級收費，鼓勵更多駕駛人士安裝遠程廢氣系統，購買採用歐盟IV型或更優良引擎的環保車輛，並同時懲罰較舊和造成污染車輛型號的使用？

行動和責任：其他交通選擇

5.2.23

替代路線可把交通從指定地區分流。對一個成功的道路收費策略來說，替代路線有多重要？為了實施道路收費，香港的基礎有哪方面需要作出改善？

5.2.24

要實施道路收費，是否必須興建免費繞道？

5.2.25

香港有良好的轉乘設施，讓市民由私家車輛轉用公共交通工具(治車轉乘)。香港的集體運輸鐵路系統也很有效率，服務範圍日見廣泛。

5.2.26

香港在運用不同型式的行人路方面也有豐富經驗。舉例來說，中國至半山行人自動扶梯不僅減低了行人對交通系統造成的負擔，該區的商業活動也由於人流暢旺而隨之興旺起來。部分擠塞地區，例如銅鑼灣，在劃出行人專用區後，也出現類似的效果。

推動道路收費

5.2.27

零售商發現，在交通受限地區，人流較多，商機也較大。這種情況帶來的好處可否用來推動實施道路收費？有甚麼誘因和利益可用來鼓勵市民接受道路收費？

5.2.28

另一方面，道路收費會否引起私隱的問題？如果會的話，涉及偵測的審查可以怎樣解決？

5.2.29

其他國家的經驗顯示道路收費可減低交通流量，然而空氣質素是否真的改善了？倫敦的研究發現收費區的氮氧化物和微粒物質減少，原因是車輛速度增加，而這因素與車輛數目的改變同樣重要。

W00045

	<p>供持份者考慮的問題 5.2.30</p> <p>在討論這項時，請持份者考慮以下問題：</p> <p>在減少由交通造成的空氣污染整體政策上，當局是否實行道路收費計劃以減輕道路空氣污染作為其中的策略？ 為了最有效地減少道路空氣污染，當局如何根據車輛的特性和排放污染物的行為，以及車輛使用的時間和地點以設計相關的道路收費政策？ 當局如何把道路收費政策，與鼓勵使用污染程度較低的交通工具(如混合動力車輛)或鼓勵選擇步行或騎自行車以達免製造污染的政策聯繫起來？</p>		
634	<p>有泛民主派議員，居然支持自由黨所提倡的「電子道路收費」主張：傳聞中還要收 \$90 一程，可是居然有泛民主派議員仍然肯支持。</p> <p>有見及此，林思將會向這些人建議，不如推出「九十粒投一票」——投票者自付好了；選舉政府的行政費，一樣應該用者自付，所有點票、點票站、填票、保安費用，用「電子道路收費」的邏輯，用者（投票者）自付，好不好？</p> <p>世界第一流的公路網就在德國，比起德國車道要好；德國除邊境的重型車之外，全國路都免費；我們不向世界第一流的汽車強國學習，反過來學習第三世界國家！當我們常常勸內地新移民時不注意保養，不注意配齊的時候，反過來，最愛贊德國車，卻最不受德國的公路制度的，就是這班香港的華人。</p> <p>為了鬧這班人對「電子道路」可以改善交通的迷信，林思在蘋果日報以至在博客上，已經寫了十數篇文章，去解釋、去反證、去邏輯討論，說明泛民主派比不識，去支持這樣無良而荒唐的制度，既不能改善交通，也不能改善環境，而且其本質既不公也不義，既得郭中黨最終選着死低下階層的市民的制度；可是這些不學無術、不求其解、不知所謂的所謂部份泛民，仍堅持支持「電子道路收費」，非要造成更多公共的歧視，搞成更不公不義的社會不可。</p> <p>支持這個制度，不會令你得到選票；田北會為你支持而投你一票嗎？反過來，泛民如果相信這個制度，最終所有後果，都要你承擔；泛民不是長期追求社會公義、公道、公正嗎？一個專向小市民開刀，向中下階層開刀的「電子道路收費」，你們也敢支持？</p> <p>既是如此，就不要俾有人反提：「投票資格應該資產審查」、「電子投票收費」、「電子過馬路收費」、「電子餐館收費」了！有誰要支持，林思唯有金出來，組織各大專會，用選票去這些不公不義不知所謂的政客說不。</p>	2015-12-12 23:17:10	
	<p>Why are we asking this now?</p> <p>Ken Livingstone yesterday announced the most wide-ranging shake-up of the London congestion charge in its controversial history. The capital's Mayor is proposing that the daily fee, which next week marks its fifth anniversaries, would more than triple to £25 for gas-guzzling vehicles. Meanwhile, the levy could be scrapped altogether for the most environment-friendly vehicles.</p> <p>The scheme – a key pledge in Mr Livingstone's mayoral election manifesto in 2000 – has quickly become part of everyday life in central London and is much studied by other cities around the world desperate to tackle congestion. Opinion remains divided over its effectiveness, and the charge is rapidly developing into a major issue in the battle for the mayoralty in May.</p> <p>How does the scheme work?</p> <p>The revolution in London's transport system began at 7am on 17 February 2003, when a network of closed-circuit television cameras started capturing the registration numbers of motorists entering the City or the West End. Drivers have until the end of the day to pay the fee, which was originally set at £5 per day and rose to £8 in July 2005.</p> <p>Last year, the charging zone was extended, despite strong opposition in local consultation exercises, to take in western Westminster, as well as Kensington and Chelsea.</p> <p>Has it cut traffic?</p> <p>At the end of the last decade, London suffered some of the worst congestion levels in Europe. The introduction of the congestion charge had an immediate impact, reducing the amount of traffic in the heart of the capital by a bout 15 per cent.</p> <p>About half the drivers who left their cars at home took public transport instead, with the rest getting a lift, using motorbikes or cycles to get to work or avoiding the area altogether. Transport for London (TfL), which administer the scheme, said the overall amount of traffic fell by 21 per cent between 2002 and 2006. The result is that 70,000 fewer vehicles are on the streets every day than before the charge began.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the number of taxis has risen by 13 per cent, bus and coaches by 25 per cent and bicycles by 49 per cent, confirming significant changes to London's transport patterns over the past five years. TfL says the extension of the charging zone to the West has produced a fall in traffic in the area of between ten and 15 per cent.</p> <p>So does this mean less congestion?</p> <p>Not necessarily. There was a drop in congestion (defined as excess delays per kilometre) of 20 to 30 per cent after the introduction of charging. TfL also claims that average traffic speeds in central London would have fallen from 10.6 mph in 2003 to 7.1 mph in 2008 but for the scheme. But the reduction in congestion has not been sustained and, to the dismay of transport experts, traffic snarl-ups appear to be slowly returning to the capital.</p> <p>Despite fewer cars being on the roads, congestion rose markedly between 2005 and 2008. TfL suggests the unwelcome increase has been caused by a surge in street works, including the replacement of water and gas main and construction of bus lanes. Peter Hendy, the commissioner of Transport for London, said yesterday: "If we had the volumes of traffic that were there before the scheme started, we would be in serious trouble."</p>		



W00044

833

What is the revenue from the scheme used for?

Last year, drivers handed over £252.4m in congestion charge payments to TfL, a fractional fall on the previous 12 months and just under 10 per cent of its total income. Running the scheme cost £130.1m and, when other costs such as administration and depreciation were taken into account, TfL was left with a net income of £89.1m from the charges.

The organisation is required by law to reinvest its "profit" into public transport in the hope it will help create a virtuous circle, tempting former drivers back on to buses. All in all, the money is a welcome fillip for the system, even if it is significantly below early claims that £130m a year could be raised.

Has business in London suffered?

Many retailers were hostile to the congestion charge from the start. John Lewis blamed the levy for a 7 per cent drop in takings at its flagship Oxford Street store in 2003, while the London Chamber of Commerce and Industry reported that 25 per cent of businesses were considering moving outside the zone.

Colin Stanbridge, the chamber's chief executive, said yesterday: "We are still of the view that the charge has had a really bad effect on retailers, particularly small retailers." He fears its long-term impact will be to change the mix of shops in central London as shoppers look to out-of-town retail parks for their larger purchases.

"If you are buying anything bigger than a toaster, you don't want to take it home on the Tube or bus," he said. TfL countered that it had no found evidence that businesses were suffering because of the charge.

So what is the future of the charge?

It will remain, in one form or another, whichever party wins the mayoral election in May. If Mr Livingstone gains a third term in office, drivers of the most polluting vehicles, such as 4x4 "Chelsea tractors", people carriers and high-performance sports cars, will have to fork out £25 a day from October. At the other end of the scale, vehicles with the lowest carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions would be allowed to enter central London for free.

What is the mayor's case for raising the charge for some vehicles?

Mr Livingstone explained: "The CO2 charge will encourage people to switch to cleaner vehicles or public transport and will ensure that those who choose to carry on driving the most polluting vehicles help to pay for the environmental damage they cause. This is the 'polluter pays' principle."

Boris Johnson, the Tory mayoral candidate, has dropped his party's opposition to the charge. But he wants it to undergo radical surgery, and has promised to scrap the western extension and introduce a "fairer" pricing structure. He said of Mr Livingstone's proposals: "Londoners use their cars because of the appalling state of the transport system. A big car tax won't change that. We need better alternatives to get out of our cars – especially those who live in the outer boroughs with bigger families, many of whom cannot afford to swap cars."

Brian Paddick, for the Lib-Dems, also wants to consider getting rid of the western extension, with a new focus on the central zone, where "traffic grinds to a halt on an almost daily basis".

So has the charge achieved its aims?

Yes...

- \* Levels of traffic in London have fallen sharply at a time when overall car ownership is rising
- \* More people are now using environmentally-friendly transport such as buses and Tube trains
- \* Traffic congestion in central London is not as bad as it was a decade ago

No...

- \* Business leaders say that the congestion charge has adversely affected the takings of retailers
- \* The capital's streets have not been transformed – despite the reduction in traffic jams
- \* Not as much as cash has been raised from the congestion charge as was originally hoped

2015-12-12  
23:15:13

W00043

832

According to TfL figures, traffic levels over the past 10 years have gone down by 10.2% but journey times for drivers have remained flat since 2007. Barry Neil, whose east London-based company Ambient Computer Services travels into central London daily delivering computer equipment, claims this is evidence the congestion charge has failed. He said: "We said when it launched it wasn't going to make any difference and unfortunately it hasn't."

"If it made it easier to drive through London, then great. But it doesn't. The jams are just as bad and it costs us £5,000 a year."

However, Elliot Jacobs, managing director of office supplies firm UOE, disagrees.

"Getting deliveries on time is really important and the congestion charge means we have a consistency of traffic flow and a reliability that we know where the traffic's going to be, and that's important. It means we can get there on time and that's worth £10 every day."

2015-12-12  
23:14:24

W00042

631	<p>"We'd expected we'd have quite a few bits of congestion on the periphery, but we couldn't find a single point where the traffic didn't flow.          "The only real problem we had were the buses were all running so ahead of schedule they had to wait at the bus stop for a couple minutes."          At the time officials from 30 other British cities were reported to be considering introducing congestion charges if London's scheme was successful.          Ad campaign against a congestion charge for Manchester          Image caption          No other British cities have adopted congestion schemes since London          That never happened and, further afield, the only cities to adopt a similar scheme since are Milan and Stockholm.          Mr Livingstone believes there are two reasons: political cowardice and "modern" cities built after the introduction of the car that do not need a congestion charge.          He said: "If it wasn't for the Republicans, who control the New York State Assembly, Manhattan island would have one. Mayor Bloomberg really wants to do it but he can't get the votes.          "In Manchester the politicians were so nervous they said: 'we'll have a referendum first'.          "If I'd had a referendum first, with all the hysteria in the newspapers - I had two and a half years of newspapers saying it would be a disaster - you'd never have got it through. It was all doom and gloom.          "Political cowardice is always going to be a problem: people think they might lose votes if they do it - but very few cities actually need it."          Mr Livingstone now sees pollution as London's biggest challenge.          Low-emission zone          "We've all woken up to the fact that in London over 4,000 people die prematurely every year because of the air quality - that's worse than 9/11," he said.          "We're not just talking about a few elderly people dying a few months early. On average they're dying 11 years early.          "We've got to tackle it - that's the low-emission zone and Boris [Johnson] should be pressing ahead very rapidly and tightening up on diesel vehicles."          Although he scrapped the scheme's western extension zone when he succeeded Mr Livingstone in 2010, Mr Johnson has described the original scheme as a success which had benefited London.          On Wednesday he announced his vision to see the world's first "Ultra Low Emission Zone", meaning by 2020 only zero or low-emission cars would be allowed into central London. Time will tell if the argument for what seems a radical change can be won.          And although the congestion charge - which was also seen as a radical step a decade ago - has won over many of the original doubters, there are still those who claim it has not been a success.</p>		2015-12-12 23:14:11
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00041

630	<p>A decade on he readily admits it was the only thing in his entire political career that "turned out better than I expected".          Motorists travelling into central London on that Monday morning faced the new £5 daily charge, and by the afternoon 57,000 had paid it.          The RAC reported there was not the anticipated early rush of drivers trying to get across the eight-square mile zone before 7am - the time the charge came in.          'Political cowardice'          Mr Livingstone said: "What was amazing was nothing went wrong.</p>		2015-12-12 23:13:47
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00040

629	<p>Right now, hybrids like the Prius, as well as super-efficient diesels, are exempt from London's pricy Congestion Charge, but TfL's latest proposals to rake in another £2 million a year aim to change that. Got a tiny diesel or a hybrid? You'll have to pay a tenner a day just to drive in London, and that plain stinks of yet more government money grubbing.</p> <p>When the Congestion Charge was first introduced, along with the Low Emission Zone introduced later covering a large swath of London, it was billed as cutting congestion in the city and potentially reducing the pollution in the air we breathe on a daily basis. It was used as an incentive to steer people away from horrendous Chelsea tractors, and towards fuel-efficient cars like the Toyota Prius. Later, when super-efficient low carbon diesels became popular, they got a good kick from Charge-avoidance too. It was good -- great for the environment and the advancement of eco-tech alike.</p> <p>But cynics assumed the real reason for TfL's stinking Congestion Charge was to rape motorists ever more of their hard earned cash. These proposals go ahead and confirm what we they, and increasingly me, all thought. TfL's really only in it for the damn money.</p> <p>It may not seem like a big deal to those who don't live in London, but hear this. London's being used as a guinea pig here -- if it works in London, which TfL obviously thinks it does, other cities will follow suit, and some already have. Durham's apparently got one, and Manchester tried to implement one too. Do you fancy being charged £10 a day just to drive in your city, and hell, if you happen to live in the zone, you even have to pay if you don't move your damn car.</p> <p>The only cars that are likely to be exempt from the Congestion Charge going forward are electric vehicles, which is about the only ray of sunshine in this dark cloud of Whitehall stealth taxation. Motoring groups are, of course, absolutely incensed, and I have to say, I am too. I can't say I'm particularly enamoured with hybrids -- a needless evolutionary stop-gap in the procession to electric or fuel-cell cars -- but by cutting their subsidy, TfL's killed one of the biggest reasons to buy a more fuel-efficient vehicle for travel in the city. If you can't skip the charge, hell, you might as well plunk for a Range Rover, if you can afford one that is</p>		2015-12-12 23:11:54
-----	--	--	------------------------

W00039

628	<p>TfL it's possible to avoid London's congestion charge by paying a lower fee to register your car as a private hire taxi, then just never pick up any passengers.</p>		2015-12-12 23:11:15
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00038

627	<p>Congestion pricing or congestion charges is a system of surcharging users of public goods that are subject to congestion through excess demand such as higher peak charges for use of bus services, electricity, metros, railways, telephones, and road pricing to reduce traffic congestion; airlines and shipping companies may be charged higher fees for slots at airports and through canals at busy times. This pricing strategy regulates demand, making it possible to manage congestion without increasing supply. Market economics theory, which encompasses the congestion pricing concept, postulates that users will be forced to pay for the negative externalities they create, making them conscious of the costs they impose upon each other when consuming during the peak demand, and more aware of their impact on the environment.</p> <p>The application on urban roads is currently limited to a few cities, including London, Stockholm, Singapore, Milan, and Gothenburg, as well as a few smaller towns, such as Durham, England; Znojmo, Czech Republic; Riga, Latvia; and Valletta, Malta. Four general types of systems are in use, a cordon area around a city center, with charges for passing the cordon line; area wide congestion pricing, which charges for being inside an area; a city center toll ring, with toll collection surrounding the city; and corridor or single facility congestion pricing, where access to a lane or a facility is priced.</p>		2015-12-12 23:09:46
-----	---	--	------------------------

W00037

W00036

W00035

626	<p>Congestion pricing or congestion charges is a system of surcharging users of public goods that are subject to congestion through excess demand such as higher peak charges for use of bus services, electricity, metros, railways, telephones, and road pricing to reduce traffic congestion; airlines and shipping companies may be charged higher fees for slots at airports and through canals at busy times. This pricing strategy regulates demand, making it possible to manage congestion without increasing supply. Market economics theory, which encompasses the congestion pricing concept, postulates that users will be forced to pay for the negative externalities they create, making them conscious of the costs they impose upon each other when consuming during the peak demand, and more aware of their impact on the environment.</p> <p>The application on urban roads is currently limited to a few cities, including London, Stockholm, Singapore, Milan, and Gothenburg, as well as a few smaller towns, such as Durham, , England; Znojmo, Czech Republic; Riga, Latvia; and Valletta, Malta. Four general types of systems are in use; a cordon area around a city center, with charges for passing the cordon line; area wide congestion pricing, which charges for being inside an area; a city center toll ring, with toll collection surrounding the city; and corridor or single facility congestion pricing, where access to a lane or a facility is priced.</p>		2015-12-12 23:09:32
625	<p>Congestion pricing or congestion charges is a system of surcharging users of public goods that are subject to congestion through excess demand such as higher peak charges for use of bus services, electricity, metros, railways, telephones, and road pricing to reduce traffic congestion; airlines and shipping companies may be charged higher fees for slots at airports and through canals at busy times. This pricing strategy regulates demand, making it possible to manage congestion without increasing supply. Market economics theory, which encompasses the congestion pricing concept, postulates that users will be forced to pay for the negative externalities they create, making them conscious of the costs they impose upon each other when consuming during the peak demand, and more aware of their impact on the environment.</p> <p>The application on urban roads is currently limited to a few cities, including London, Stockholm, Singapore, Milan, and Gothenburg, as well as a few smaller towns, such as Durham, , England; Znojmo, Czech Republic; Riga, Latvia; and Valletta, Malta. Four general types of systems are in use; a cordon area around a city center, with charges for passing the cordon line; area wide congestion pricing, which charges for being inside an area; a city center toll ring, with toll collection surrounding the city; and corridor or single facility congestion pricing, where access to a lane or a facility is priced.</p>		2015-12-12 23:09:22
624	<p>Singapore[edit] Main article: Electronic Road Pricing In an effort to improve the pricing mechanism, and, to introduce real-time variable pricing,[44] Singapore's LTA together with IBM, ran a pilot from December 2006 to April 2007, with a traffic estimation and prediction tool (TrEPS), which uses historical traffic data and real-time feeds with flow conditions from several sources, in order to predict the levels of congestion up to an hour in advance. By accurately estimating prevailing and emerging traffic conditions, this technology is expected to allow variable pricing, together with improved overall traffic management, including the provision of information in advance to alert drivers about conditions ahead, and the prices being charged at that moment.[45][46] In 2010 the Land Transport Authority began exploring the potential of Global Navigation Satellite System as a technological option for a second generation ERP. LTA objective is to evaluate if the latest technologies available in the market today are accurate and effective enough for use as a congestion charging tool, especially taking into consideration the dense urban environment in Singapore. Implementation of such system is not expected in the short term.[47]</p> <p>London[edit] Main article: London congestion charge A proposal by former Mayor of London Ken Livingstone would have resulted in a new pricing structure based on potential CO2 emission rates by October 2008.[48] The goal was that vehicles with the very lowest CO2 emissions on rates would be exempted, and those with higher emission rates would pay a new higher charge of £25, with the rest paying the same charge they pay today.[49] However, the current Mayor of London, Boris Johnson, announced at the beginning of his administration that he would reform the congestion charge.[50][51] Johnson announced on July 2008 that the new CO2 charging structure will no longer be implemented.[52] Among other reasons, he said the environmental charge would encourage travel by thousands of smaller vehicles free of charge, resulting in increase congestion and pollution.[52][53] He also discarded plans for extending the charge zone to the suburbs, and announced he will review the western extension implemented in 2007, based on a public consultation planned for September 2008.[54] Having held a five-week public consultation with residents in the autumn of 2008, Johnson decided to remove the 2007 Western Extension from the congestion charging zone beginning on January 4, 2011, to increase the basic charge to £10, and also to introduce an automated payment system called Congestion Charging Auto Pay (CC Auto Pay), which will charge vehicles based on the number of charging days a vehicle travels within the charging zone each month, and the drivers of these vehicles will pay a reduced £9 daily charge.[55] In November 2012 Transport for London (TfL) presented a proposal to abolish the Greener Vehicle Discount that benefited, among others, vehicles with small diesel engines that avoid the charge because their engines produce emissions of less than 100g per km of CO2.[56][57] Approved by Mayor Boris Johnson in April 2013, the Ultra Low Emission Discount (ULED) went into effect on 1 July 2013. The ULED introduced more stringent emission standards that limit the free access to the congestion charge zone to all-electric cars, some plug-in hybrids, and any car or van that emits 75g/km or less of CO2 and meets the Euro 5 emission standards for air quality. The measure was designed to curb the growing number of diesel vehicles on London's roads. About 20,000 owners of vehicles registered for the Greener Vehicle Discount by June 2013 were granted a three-year sunset period (until 24 June 2016) before they have to pay the full congestion charge.[58][59][60]</p> <p>Entrance to Milan Area C Since the congestion charge introduction in 2003, over £1.2 billion has been invested in transport through December 2013, including £960 million on improvements to the bus network; £102 million on roads and bridges; £70 million on road safety; £51 million on local transport/borough plans; and £36 million on sustainable transport and the environment.[61] There has been criticism because during the first ten years since the scheme was implemented, gross revenue reached about £2.6 billion, but only £1.2 billion has been invested, meaning that 54% of gross revenues have been spent in operating the system and administrative expenses.[62] In June 2014 the standard charge was raised 15% from £10 per day to £11.50.[63] According to TfL the objective of the increase is to recoup inflation over the previous three years and ensure the charge remains an effective deterrent to making unnecessary journeys in central London.[64]</p> <p>Milan[edit] Main articles: Ecopass and Milan Area C The Ecopass pollution charge ended on December 31, 2011, and was replaced by the Area C scheme, which went into effect on January 16, 2012, initially as an 18-month pilot program. The Area C scheme is a conventional congestion pricing scheme and is based on the same Ecopass geographic area. Vehicles entering the charging zone incur a charge of €5 regardless of their pollution level. However, residents inside the area have 40 free entries per year and then a discounted charge of €2.[37][65][66] Electric vehicles, public utility vehicles, police and emergency vehicles, buses and taxis are exempted from the charge. Hybrid electric and bi-fuel natural gas vehicles (CNG and LPG) were exempted until January 1, 2013.[66] The scheme was made permanent in March 2013. All net earnings from Area C are invested to promote sustainable mobility and policies to reduce air pollution, including the redevelopment, protection and development of public transport, "soft mobility" (pedestrians, cycling, Zone 30) and systems to rationalize the distribution of goods.[67]</p> <p>"Old town" centres[edit] See also: Durham City congestion charge</p>		2015-12-12 23:08:28

W00034

	<p>A map of Greater Manchester highlighting area of the rejected congestion charging scheme</p> <p>Around Europe several relatively small cities, such as Durham, England,[68] Znojmo, Czech Republic,[69] Riga, Latvia,[70][71] and Valletta, Malta,[72][73] have implemented congestion pricing to reduce traffic crowding, parking problems and pollution, particularly during the peak tourism season.</p> <p>Durham introduced charges in October 2002, reducing vehicle traffic by 85% after a year; prior to this 3,000 daily vehicles had shared the streets with 17,000 pedestrians.[74]</p> <p>Valletta has reduced daily vehicles entering the city from 10,000 to 7,900; making 400 readily available parking places in the center. There has been a 60% drop in car stays by non-residents of more than eight hours, but there has been a marked increase of 34% in non-residential cars visiting the city for an hour or less.[73][75]</p>		
623	<p>Urban roads[edit]</p> <p>For the broader concept on roads charges see road pricing.</p> <p>An introductory flowchart describing congestion pricing</p> <p>Practical implementations of road congestion pricing are found almost exclusively in urban areas, because traffic congestion is common in and around city centers. Autoroute A1 in Northern France is one of the few cases of congestion pricing implemented outside of urban areas. This is an expressway connecting Paris to Lille, and since 1992 congestion prices have been applied during weekends with the objective of spreading demand on the trip back to Paris on Sunday afternoons and evenings.[23] As congestion pricing has been increasing worldwide, the schemes implemented have been classified into four different types: cordon area around a city center; area wide congestion pricing; city center toll ring; and corridor or single facility congestion pricing.[24]</p> <p>Cordon area and area wide[edit]</p> <p>See also: Electronic Road Pricing (Singapore), London congestion charge, Stockholm congestion tax, Ecopass, Milan Area C and Gothenburg congestion tax</p> <p>At Old Street, street markings and a sign (inset) with the white-on-red C alert drivers to the congestion charge, London.</p> <p>The control point at Liljeholmen, Stockholm.</p> <p>Cordon area congestion pricing is a fee or tax paid by users to enter a restricted area, usually within a city center, as part of a demand management strategy to relieve traffic congestion within that area.[25] The economic rationale for this pricing scheme is based on the externalities or social costs of road transport, such as air pollution, noise, traffic accidents, environmental and urban deterioration, and the extra costs and delays imposed by traffic congestion upon other drivers when additional users enter a congested road.[26]</p> <p>The first implementation of such a scheme was Singapore Area Licensing Scheme in 1975, together with a comprehensive package of road pricing measures, stringent car ownership rules and improvements in mass transit.[27][28] Thanks to technological advances in electronic toll collection, electronic detection, and video surveillance technology, collecting congestion fees has become easier. Singapore upgraded its system in 1998,[29] and similar pricing schemes were implemented in Rome in 2001,[30] London in 2003 with extensions in 2007; Stockholm in 2006, as a seven-month trial, and then on a permanent basis.[31] In January 2008 Milan began a one-year trial program called Ecopass, charging low emission standard vehicles and exempting cleaner and alternative fuel vehicles.[32][33][34] The Ecopass program was extended until December 31, 2011,[35][36] and on January 16, 2012 was replaced by Area C, a trial program that converted the scheme from a pollution-charge to a congestion charge.[37] The Gothenburg congestion tax was implemented in January 2013 and it was modeled after the Stockholm scheme.[38]</p> <p>Although there has not yet been a comprehensive study, initial reports from the cities that have implemented congestion pricing schemes show traffic volume reductions from 10% to 30%,[39] as well as reduced air pollution.</p> <p>[40] Also, all cities report public controversy before and after implementation, making political feasibility a critical issue.</p> <p>Singapore and Stockholm charge a congestion fee every time a user crosses the cordon area, while London charges a daily fee for any vehicle driving in a public road within the congestion charge zone, regardless of how many times the user crosses the cordon.[41] Stockholm has put a cap on the maximum daily tax,[42] while in Singapore the charge is based on a pay-as-you-use principle, and rates are set based on traffic conditions at the pricing points, and reviewed on a quarterly basis. Through this policy, the Land Transport Authority (LTA) reports that the electronic road pricing "has been effective in maintaining an optimal speed range of 45 to 65 km/h for expressways and 20 to 30 km/h for arterial roads".[43]</p>		2015-12-12 23:08:07

W00033

622	<p>Congestion pricing is a concept from market economics regarding the use of pricing mechanisms to charge the users of public goods for the negative externalities generated by the peak demand in excess of available supply. Its economic rationale is that, at a price of zero, demand exceeds supply, causing a shortage, and that the shortage should be corrected by charging the equilibrium price rather than shifting it down by increasing the supply. Usually this means increasing prices during certain periods of time or at the places where congestion occurs, or introducing a new usage tax or charge when peak demand exceeds available supply in the case of a tax-funded public good provided free at the point of usage.</p> <p>Economic rationale for moving from untolled equilibrium to congestion pricing equilibrium. According to the economic theory behind congestion pricing, the objective of this policy is the use of the price mechanism to make users more aware of the costs that they impose upon one another when consuming during the peak demand, and that they should pay for the additional congestion they create, thus encouraging the redistribution of the demand in space or in time,[6][7] or shifting it to the consumption of a substitute public good; for example, switching from private transport to public transport.</p> <p>This pricing mechanism has been used in several public utilities and public services for setting higher prices during congested periods, as a means to better manage the demand for the service, and whether to avoid expensive new investments just to satisfy peak demand, or because it is not economically or financially feasible to provide additional capacity to the service. Congestion pricing has been widely used by telephone and electric utilities, metros, railways and autobus services,[8] and has been proposed for charging internet access.[9] It also has been extensively studied and advocated by mainstream transport economists for ports, waterways, airports and road pricing, though actual implementation is rather limited due to the controversial issues subject to debate regarding this policy, particularly for urban roads, such as undesirable distribution effects, the disposition of the revenues raised, and the social and political acceptability of the congestion charge.[10][11]</p> <p>Congestion pricing is one of a number of alternative demand side (as opposed to supply side) strategies offered by economists to address traffic congestion.[12] Congestion is considered a negative externality by economists.[13] An externality occurs when a transaction causes costs or benefits to a third party, often, although not necessarily, from the use of a public good: for example, if manufacturing or transportation cause air pollution imposing costs on others when making use of public air. Congestion pricing is an efficiency pricing strategy that requires the users to pay more for that public good, thus increasing the welfare gain or net benefit for society.[14][15] Nobel-laureate William Vickrey is considered by some to be the father of congestion pricing, as he first proposed it for the New York City Subway system in 1952.[16][17][18] In the road transportation arena these theories were extended by Maurice Allais, Gabriel Roth who was instrumental in the first designs and upon whose World Bank recommendation the first system was put in place in Singapore.[19] Also, it was considered by the Smeed Report, published by the British Ministry of Transport in 1964,[20] but its recommendations were rejected by successive British governments.[21]</p> <p>The transport economics rationale for implementing congestion pricing on roads, described as "one policy response to the problem of congestion", was summarized in testimony to the United States Congress Joint Economic Committee in 2003: "congestion is considered to arise from the mispricing of a good; namely, highway capacity at a specific place and time. The quantity supplied (measured in lane-miles) is less than the quantity demanded at what is essentially a price of zero. If a good or service is provided free of charge, people tend to demand more of it—and use it more wastefully—than they would if they had to pay a price that reflected its cost. Hence, congestion pricing is premised on a basic economic concept: charge a price in order to allocate a scarce resource to its most valuable use, as evidenced by users' willingness to pay for the resource".[2]</p>		2015-12-12 23:07:46
621	<p>Rejected proposals[edit] See also: Congestion charging in Greater Manchester, Edinburgh congestion charge, Electronic Road Pricing (Hong Kong) and New York congestion pricing</p> <p>The New York City congestion pricing proposal was nixed by the New York State Legislature in 2008.</p> <p>Hong Kong conducted a pilot test on an electronic congestion pricing system between 1983 and 1985 with positive results.[76] However, public opposition against this policy stalled its permanent implementation.</p> <p>In 2002 Edinburgh, United Kingdom, initiated an implementation process; a referendum was conducted in 2005,[77] with a majority of 74.4% rejecting the proposal.[78][79]</p> <p>Councils from across the West Midlands in the United Kingdom, including Birmingham and Coventry, rejected the idea of imposing congestion pricing schemes on the area in 2008, despite promises from central government of transport project funding in exchange for the implementation of a road pricing pilot scheme.[80]</p> <p>In 2007, New York City shelved a proposal for a three-year pilot program for implementation in Manhattan,[17][81][82][83] and a new proposition was denied in 2008,[84] with potential federal grants of USD 354 million being reallocated to other American cities.[85][86]</p> <p>Greater Manchester, United Kingdom, was considering a scheme with two cordons, one covering the main urban core of the Greater Manchester Urban Area and another covering the Manchester city centre.[87][88][89] The measure was supported by the government,[90] but three local authorities rejected it (Bury, Trafford and Stockport); the support of two-thirds of Manchester's 10 local councils was needed for it to be implemented.[91] A comprehensive transport investment package for Manchester, which included the congestion pricing element, was released for further public consultation and was to be subject of a referendum in December 2008.[92] On 12 December 2008 the scheme was overwhelmingly rejected by 10 out of 10 councils by a public referendum.[93]</p>		2015-12-12 23:06:48
620	<p>China[edit]</p> <p>Severe air pollution in Beijing. Motor vehicle emissions account for 31% of the city's smog sources.[106]</p> <p>In September 2011, local officials announced plans to introduce congestion pricing in Beijing. No details were provided regarding the magnitude of the congestion charges or the charge zone.[107] The measure was initially proposed in 2010 and was recommended by the World Bank.[108][109] A similar scheme was proposed for the city Guangzhou, Guangdong province, in early 2010. The city opened a public discussion on whether to introduce congestion charges. An online survey conducted by two local news outlets found that 84.4% of respondents opposed the charges.[109]</p> <p>In December 2015, the Beijing Municipal Commission of Transport announced plans to introduce congestion charges in 2016. According to city's motor vehicle emission control plan 2013-2017, the congestion charge will be a real-time variable pricing scheme based on actual traffic flows and emissions data, and allow the fee to be charged for different vehicles and varying by time of the day and for different districts. The Dongcheng and Xicheng are among the districts that are most likely to firstly implement congestion charge. Vehicle emissions account for 31% of the city's smog sources, according to Beijing Environmental Protection Bureau. The local government has implemented already several policies to address air quality and congestion, such as a driving restriction scheme based upon the last digits on their license plates.[106][110]</p>		2015-12-12 23:06:24

W00032

W00031

W00030

619	<p>Measurement of effects[edit]</p> <p>In a road network, congestion can be considered a specific measure of the time delay in a journey or time lost through traffic jams. Delays can be caused by some combination of traffic density, road capacity, and the delaying effects of other road users and traffic management schemes such as traffic lights, junctions, and street works. This can be measured as the extra journey time needed to traverse a congested route when compared to the same route with no such interference. However, this technical definition of congestion as a measurement of delay can get confused and used interchangeably with traffic density in the public mind.[142]</p> <p>To measure the true effects of any traffic management scheme it is normally necessary to establish a baseline, or "do nothing" case, which estimates the effects on the network without any changes other than normal trends and expected local changes. Notably this was not done for the London Congestion Charging Scheme, which has led to claims that it is not possible to determine the extent of the actual influence of the scheme.[143] Regardless of the scheme's impact, in a retrospective analysis Transport for London (TfL) estimated there would have already been a significant reduction in traffic as a consequence of parking policies and increased congestion due to traffic management and other interventions that had the effect of reducing highway capacity. In 2006, the last year before the zone was expanded, TfL observed that traffic flows were lower than in any recent year, while network traffic speeds were also lower than in any recent year.[144]</p> <p>After ten years since its implementation in 2013, TfL reported that the congestion charging scheme resulted in a 10% reduction in traffic volumes from baseline conditions, and an overall reduction of 11% in vehicle kilometres in London between 2000 and 2012. Despite these gains, traffic speeds have also been getting progressively slower over the past decade, particularly in central London. TfL explains that the historic decline in traffic speeds is most likely due to interventions that have reduced the effective capacity of the road network in order to improve the urban environment, increase road safety and prioritise public transport, pedestrian and cycle traffic, as well as an increase in road works by utilities and general development activity since 2006. TfL concludes that while levels of congestion in central London are close to pre-charging levels, the effectiveness of the congestion charge in reducing traffic volumes means that conditions would be worse without the Congestion Charging scheme.[145]</p>	2015-12-12 23:05:30
-----	---	------------------------

W00029

618	<p>Academic debate and concerns[edit]</p> <p>Even the transport economists who advocate congestion pricing have anticipated several practical limitations, concerns and controversial issues regarding the actual implementation of this policy. As summarized by Cervero:[146]</p> <p>"True social-cost pricing of metropolitan travel has proven to be a theoretical ideal that so far has eluded real-world implementation. The primary obstacle is that except for professors of transportation economics and a cadre of vocal environmentalists, few people are in favor of considerably higher charges for peak-period travel. Middle-class motorists often complain they already pay too much in gasoline taxes and registration fees to drive their cars, and that to pay more during congested periods would add insult to injury. In the United States, few politicians are willing to champion the cause of congestion pricing for fear of reprisal from their constituents. Critics also argue that charging more to drive is elitist policy, pricing the poor off of roads so that the wealthy can move about unencumbered. It is for all these reasons that peak-period pricing remains a pipe dream in the minds of many."</p> <p>Both Button [147] and Small et al.[11] have identified the following issues:</p> <p>The real-world demand functions for urban road travel are more complex than the theoretical functions used in transport economics analysis. Congestion pricing was developed as a first-best solution, based on the assumption that the optimal price of road space equals the marginal cost price if all other goods in the economy are also marginal cost priced. In the real world this is not true, thus, actual implementation of congestion pricing is just a proxy or second-best solution. Based on the economic principles behind congestion pricing, the optimal congestion charge should make up for the difference between the average cost paid by the driver and the marginal cost imposed on other drivers (such as extra delay) and on society as a whole (such as air pollution). The practical challenge of setting optimal link-based tolls is daunting given that neither the demand functions nor the link-specific speed-flow curves can be known precisely. Therefore, transport economists recognize that in practice setting the right price for the congestion charge becomes a trial and error experience.</p> <p>Inequality issue: A main concern is the possibility of undesirable distribution repercussions because of the diversity of road users. The use of the tolled road depends on the user's level of income. Where some can not afford to pay the congestion charge, then this policy is likely to privilege the middle-class and rich. The users who shift to some less-preferred alternative are also worse off. The less wealthy are the more likely to switch to public transit. Road space rationing is another strategy generally viewed as more equitable than congestion pricing. However, high-income users can always avoid the travel restrictions by owning a second car and users with relatively inelastic demand (such as a worker who needs to transport tools to a job site) are relatively more impacted.[148]</p> <p>There are difficulties in deciding how to allocate the revenues raised. This is a controversial issue among scholars. The revenues can be used to improve public transport (as is the case in London), or to invest in new road infrastructure (as in Oslo). Some academics make the case that revenues should be disposed as a direct transfer payments to former road users. Congestion pricing is not intended to increase public revenues or to become just another tax, however this is precisely one of the main concerns of road users and taxpayers.</p> <p>One alternative, aimed at avoiding inequality and revenue allocation issues, is to implement a rationing of peak period travel through mobility rights or revenue-neutral credit-based congestion pricing.[149] This system would be similar to the existing emissions trading of carbon credit. Metropolitan area or city residents, or the taxpayers, would be issued mobility rights or congestion credits, and would have the option of using these for themselves, or trading or selling them to anyone willing to continue traveling by automobile beyond their personal quota. This trading system would allow direct benefits to be accrued by those users shifting to public transportation or by those reducing their peak-hour travel rather than the government.[150][151]</p>	2015-12-12 23:05:11
-----	---	------------------------

W00028

617

Public controversy

Experience from the few cities where congestion pricing has been implemented shows that social and political acceptability is key. Public discontent with congestion pricing, or rejection of congestion pricing proposals, is due mainly to the inequality issues, the economic burden on neighboring communities, the effect on retail businesses and the economic activity in general, and the fears that the revenues will become just another tax.

Congestion pricing remains highly controversial with the public both before and after implementation. This has in part been resolved through referendums, such as after the seven-month trial period in Stockholm,[152] however this creates a debate as to where the border line for the referendum should go, since it is often the people living outside the urban area who have to pay the tax, while the external benefit is granted those who live within the area. In Stockholm there was a majority in the referendum within the city border (where the votes counted), but not outside.

Some concerns have also been expressed regarding the effects of cordon area congestion pricing on economic activity and land use,[155] as the benefits are usually evaluated from the urban transportation perspective only. However, congestion pricing schemes have been used with the main objective of improving urban quality and to preserve historical heritage in the small cities.

The effects of a charge on business have been disputed; reports have shops and businesses being heavily impacted by the cost of the charge, both in terms of lost sales and increased delivery costs in London,[157] while others show that businesses were then supporting the charge six months after implementation.[158] Reports show business activity within the charge zone had been higher in both productivity and profitability and that the charge had a "broadly neutral impact" on the London wide economy,[159] while others claim an average drop in business of 25% following the 2007 extension.

Other criticism has been raised concerning the environmental effects on neighborhoods bordering the congestion zone, with critics claiming that congestion pricing would create "parking lots" and add more traffic and pollution to those neighborhoods,[161] and the imposition of a regressive tax on some commuters.[162][163] Stockholm's trial of congestion pricing, however, showed a reduction in traffic in areas outside the congestion zone.[164] Other opponents argue that the pricing could become a tax on middle- and lower-class residents, since those citizens would be affected the most financially.[165] The installation of cameras for tracking purposes may also raise civil liberties concerns.

2015-12-12  
23:04:41

現有各個自動收費系統的兼容問題

目的

1.本文件旨在向委員介紹本港目前採用的各個自動收費系統，並且就解決兼容問題，討論可行的方案。

背景

2.本港首個自動車輛輪候收費系統（下文簡稱“自動收費系統”）稱為“簡易通”，於一九九三年八月在海底隧道和香港仔隧道裝設。獅子山隧道、東區海底隧道和西區海底隧道也採用同一系統。第二個自動收費系統，即“電子收費系統”，則在一九九六年五月在大老山隧道啟用，其後在一九九七年十月也應用於城門隧道和將軍澳隧道。貴賓管制區，以及建成後屬三號幹線郊野公園一段的一部分的大樓隧道亦將使用電子收費系統。

3.在政府隧道和私營隧道裝設自動收費系統，都須經運輸署署長批准。不過，選用哪一個自動收費系統，是隧道營辦商的商業決定。此外，根據各項私營隧道條例，運輸署署長有權要求營辦商拆除已核准的自動收費系統。

兼容問題

4.本港目前使用的兩個自動收費系統不能兼容。駕車人士如要在所有收費道路上享用自動收費所帶來的好處，必須同時成為兩個系統的登記用戶。

5.迄今，電子收費業仍未制訂劃一的標準，以確保由不同供應商製造的產品可以兼容。此外，目前也沒有任何國際或國家訂立的標準，可供我們參照，以確保本港的自動收費系統可以兼容。由於電子收費業在本港的業務和市場規模細小，要本港自行訂立標準，是不切實際的。英國、日本和歐洲現正嘗試訂立或釐定一套通用的國家標準，這些標準也許在幾年後可供使用。

6.由於目前仍沒有國際或國家訂立的標準，確保兼容的唯一方法，是只批准使用一種自動收費系統。不過，電子收費方面的科技日新月異，如有更先進而功能更佳之系統問世，政府實在難以不批准人們使用，因此，上述做法並不適當。政府也不宜利用行政措施造成壟斷的局面，以免違背自由貿易和公平競爭的原則。

#### 解決系統不兼容問題的可行方案

7.由於有市民認為在車內裝上兩個標籤會帶來不便和可能造成混亂，運輸署研究了多個不同的方案，以解決問題。

方案 I-- 撤銷對簡易通或電子收費系統的批准，以便只有一個系統可繼續在全港的收費道時運作。

方案 II-- 在同一條收費行車線前後裝設兩個自動收費系統，即為現已裝有簡易通的隧道，在同一條自動收費車輛行車線加裝電子收費系統，但裝設的位置須與現有系統的位置相隔若干距離；至於現已裝有電子收費系統的隧道，會依樣加裝簡易通。

方案 III-- 在毗連的收費行車線並排裝設兩個系統，即為現已裝有簡易通的隧道，在不同的收費行車線加裝電子收費系統；至於現已裝有電子收費系統的隧道，會依樣加裝簡易通。

方案 IV-- 研製可同時閱讀簡易通電子標籤和電子收費系統標籤的共用感應器。

方案 V-- 暫時維持現狀。

方案 I -- 撤銷其中一個已核准的自動收費系統



8.運輸署署長可以考慮撤銷其中一個已核准的自動收費系統，並以餘下的一個系統取而代之。這方案有以下缺點：

以私營隧道來說，雖然運輸署署長有權指示隧道營辦商拆除已核准的自動收費系統，但營辦商可根據有關的隧道條例，向行政長官會同行政會議提出上訴，或申請司法覆核，向政府索償。而且，對於已登記成為系統用戶的駕車人士來說，所用系統一旦被撤銷，會造成極多干擾和不便。

以政府擁有的隧道來說，管理合約中並沒有充分的法律依據，要求管理營辦商拆除已核准的自動收費系統。同樣，政府隧道營辦商也可申請司法覆核，向政府索償。

正如上文第6段所解釋，政府不宜利用行政措施造成壟斷的局面。

方案II--在同一條收費行車線安裝兩個系統

9.根據這方案，同一條自動收費車輛行車線上會安裝兩個感應器，以便閱讀兩種車輛標籤。車輛會先後在兩個感應器下通過，假如車輛沒有有效的標籤或在兩個系統下都不能繳費，合併了的執法系統才會拍攝有關車輛的影像。兩個現有的自動收費系統必須大幅合併，以確保在真正發生車輛逃繳費的個案時，才採取執法行動。要做到這一點，兩個系統的供應商必須互相合作，並須披露其系統的專有經營資料。我們預期會出現下列問題：

由於在同一條收費行車線安裝兩種感應器，無線電頻率會互相干擾，因而影響自動收費系統的準確度。

由於有關系統的營辦商彼此是競爭對手，因此不會願意合作或相互披露機密的專有經營資料。政府也沒有法定權力，可以強制他們披露上述資料。

由於每個自動收費系統都是經營者專有的研製成果，假如有關系統供應商拒絕披露機密的專有經營資料，當局便難以物色到適合的顧問/承辦商，可以就上述合併系統進行詳細的研究和設計工作。

“建造、營運及移交”協議以及運輸署簽訂的隧道管理合約內並無法律條文，規定私營隧道和政府隧道的營辦商須安裝超過一個自動收費系統。

與單設一個自動收費系統比較，這方案所需的設備裝配費用和處理每日交收事宜所需的營運費用，都會大幅增加。這情況可能導致用戶月費上升。

發展(包括實地試用)和實施上述合併系統,以及就現有自動收費服務營辦商可能提出的空價達成和解,會涉及大量款項。

要發展和實行這方案,可能需時三至四年,屆時可能已有一些國際/國家訂立的標準,又或本港已採用電子道閘收費辦法,以致研製所得的成果變得不合時宜,徒然浪費資源。

方案III--在不同的收費行車線分別裝設兩個系統  
10.根據這方案,有些人手收費行車線須改裝為自動收費車輛行車線。初步研究顯示,這樣做可能有以下問題:

即使在不同的行車線並排裝設上述兩個系統,仍可能出現無線電頻率互相干擾的情況,影響有關系統的準確度。不過,干擾程度可能較方案II的為小。

假如在相隔一段距離的兩條不同行車線裝設上述兩個系統,車輛在駛往指定的自動收費亭時,會穿插轉線(特別是車輛在最後關頭才穿插轉線),這樣便會更易發生交通意外。

把人手收費行車線改裝為自動收費車輛行車線,會導致交通擠塞,尤以繁忙時間為然。此外,某些隧道(如獅子山隧道和海唇隧道)的收費行車線並不足夠,無法實行這方案。

此外,這方案同樣有方案II(c)至(g)項的問題。

方案IV--兩個系統共用同一感應器

11.如採納這方案,就需要進行研究工作,以研製和設計一個能閱讀兩種系統標籤的感應器。雖然其他行車線設備(如軌法用的閉路電視攝影機)大部分可維持不變,但上述兩個自動收費系統所用的感應器技術實在完全不同。其中一個系統採用唯讀技術,可閱讀標籤和加以鑑別,而另一系統則採用讀寫技術,能夠在閱讀標籤後,把戶口餘額寫回標籤上面。由於在感應器的設計和標籤數據格式上,有這些基本不同之處,因此很難研製出一個可供上述兩個系統共用的感應器。此外,如要把新的共用感應器與上述兩個系統現有的設備合併,會涉及其他難以克服的問題,而且還需要兩個系統供應商合作,以及披露機密的專有經營資料。在技術的角度上說,整個過程會比方案II所涉及的過程更為困難和費時。

方案V--暫時維持現狀

12. 電子道路收費可行性研究仍在進行，現階段正在測試多種新技術。假如證實電子道路收費辦法可行，以及如果當局決定在本港實行這個收費辦法，則徵收道路費的工作便可納入電子道路收費系統。屆時，駕車人士便不用分別登記為各個自動收費系統的用戶，提供自動收費服務的公司可能會因為失掉這筆生意，而向政府索償。有關方面進行目前的電子道路收費研究時，會研究電子道路收費辦法所牽涉的立法和財務問題，以及對機構制度和運作事宜帶來的影響。

13. 可行性研究完成後，即使當局決定不實行電子道路收費辦法，屆時美國、歐洲或日本可能已經訂立國家標準，我們就可以採用其中一套標準，或在必要時加以改良，供本港使用。提供自動收費服務的公司或隧道營辦商可能會根據現有的專營權合約或管理合約，索取賠償。

#### 結論和未來路向

14. 本港的自動收費服務，是由幾家私營的自動收費公司以商業經營方式提供的。使用這些服務，純屬自願性質，駕車人士亦可選用人手收費的行李車線。

15. 雖然政府鼓勵隧道營辦商為駕車人士提供選擇，讓他們可以選用自動收費辦法，但政府不宜只限批准一種收費系統，因為這樣會造成壟斷的局面，違背自由貿易和公平競爭的政策。基於這個理由，以及在法律和財務方面會造成的影響，方案裡不可取。

16. 方案II至IV把現有兩個自動收費系統合併，會在技術上遇到重大困難，更需要系統供應商披露機密的專有經營資料。但是，有關供應商不大可能會這樣做。鑑於新訂的國家標準可能會在幾年後制定，而且長遠來說，本港可能會實行電子道路收費辦法，因此，對於在實行之前需要籌備多年的方案II至方案IV，也實在沒有必要加以考慮。

17. 鑑於以上考慮結果，我們有意維持現狀，直至本港決定是否實行電子道路收費辦法，或有新訂的國家標準可供採用為止。

運輸局

一九九七年十月

W00026	615	<p>Barry Neil, whose east London-based company Ambient Computer Services travels into central London daily delivering computer equipment, claims this is evidence the congestion charge has failed. He said: "We said when it launched it wasn't going to make any difference and unfortunately it hasn't. "If it made it easier to drive through London, then great. But it doesn't. The jams are just as bad and it costs us £5,000 a year."</p> <p>However, Elliot Jacobs, managing director of office supplies firm UOE, disagrees. "Getting deliveries on time is really important and the congestion charge means we have a consistency of traffic flow and a reliability that we know where the traffic's going to be, and that's important. "It means we can get there on time and that's worth £10 every day."</p>	2015-12-12 22:58:18
W00025	614	<p>Low-emission zone          "We've all woken up to the fact that in London over 4,000 people die prematurely every year because of the air quality - that's worse than 9/11," he said.          "We're not just talking about a few elderly people dying a few months early. On average they're dying 11 years early."          "We've got to tackle it - that's the low-emission zone and Boris [Johnson] should be pressing ahead very rapidly and tightening up on diesel vehicles."          Although he scrapped the scheme's western extension zone when he succeeded Mr Livingstone in 2010, Mr Johnson has described the original scheme as a success which had benefited London.          On Wednesday he announced his vision to see the world's first "Ultra Low Emission Zone", meaning by 2020 only zero or low-emission cars would be allowed into central London. Time will tell if the argument for what seems a radical change can be won.          And although the congestion charge - which was also seen as a radical step a decade ago - has won over many of the original doubters, there are still those who claim it has not been a success.</p>	2015-12-12 22:57:44
W00024	613	<p>"We'd expected we'd have quite a few bits of congestion on the periphery, but we couldn't find a single point where the traffic didn't flow.          "The only real problem we had were the buses were all running so ahead of schedule they had to wait at the bus stop for a couple minutes."          At the time officials from 30 other British cities were reported to be considering introducing congestion charges if London's scheme was successful.          Ad campaign against a congestion charge for Manchester          Image caption          No other British cities have adopted congestion schemes since London          That never happened and, further afield, the only cities to adopt a similar scheme since are Milan and Stockholm.          Mr Livingstone believes there are two reasons: political cowardice and "modern" cities built after the introduction of the car that do not need a congestion charge.          He said: "If it wasn't for the Republicans, who control the New York State Assembly, Manhattan island would have one. Mayor Bloomberg really wants to do it but he can't get the votes.          "In Manchester the politicians were so nervous they said: 'we'll have a referendum first'.          "If I'd had a referendum first, with all the hysteria in the newspapers - I had two and a half years of newspapers saying it would be a disaster - you'd never have got it through. It was all doom and gloom.          "Political cowardice is always going to be a problem: people think they might lose votes if they do it - but very few cities actually need it."          Mr Livingstone now sees pollution as London's biggest challenge.</p>	2015-12-12 22:57:26
W00023	612	<p>A decade on he readily admits it was the only thing in his entire political career that "turned out better than I expected".</p> <p>Motorists travelling into central London on that Monday morning faced the new £5 daily charge, and by the afternoon 57,000 had paid it.</p> <p>The RAC reported there was not the anticipated early rush of drivers trying to get across the eight-square mile zone before 7am - the time the charge came in.</p> <p>'Political cowardice'</p> <p>Mr Livingstone said: "What was amazing was nothing went wrong.</p>	2015-12-12 22:56:45
W00022	611	<p>it seems wasting the time to consult and implement</p>	2015-12-12 16:46:33

W00021

610	<p>香港雖然是一個國際城市，甚至是一個所謂(或被譽為國際都會)，但在各個公營及私營機構，所做出來的效率及成效，簡單而言，效率甚差。</p> <p>本人在中環工作多年，從坐巴士、電車、地鐵，以至現時為一位全職司機，每日多次來來回回，在中環、上環、金鐘、灣仔、銅鑼灣等一帶地方開車出入。</p> <p>多種不同車輛出入中環，導致交通擠塞，本人覺得不單單是私家車的原因，其轉機究竟，是中環這個地方是香港的核心，各大公司在此作總部，這些總部的高層人員均有大量高層以私家車代步，包括本人經常見到的名人，在繁忙時間，倘若徵立法會議員，其私家車亦會在喜來街非法上落，每一架車的出入均導致堵塞的原因，但，對這些高層人員，名人，收費對他們根本起不出作用，反之，有一部份人還而求其次，會以的士代步，到時只會更難擠擠的士而衍生Uber這類不倫不類的合法無牌車出現，這類車出現，只是代替了一部份公司私家車，但根本陣可能減低在中環堵塞的作用。</p> <p>收費更是不平等的行為，根本係係用者自負，有幾人根本唔可能亦唔會怕這類收費，收費根本係政府增加收入的藉口。市場上，政府沒有限制車量的數量，而道路及停車位根本唔平衡，灣仔的繞道遠達成，三條隧道的收費不平衡，不鼓勵各大公司不在中環開設公司，甚至政府都要在金鐘作政府總部，為何不自行帶頭在市郊興建呢？這問題根本原因就係政府在各方面都縮配，導至現時中環一帶地區塞車原因，但卻要其他汽車使用者付費，完全扭曲事實，政府沒有做塞車工作。</p> <p>本人建議：</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.先平衡三條隧道收費，營運汽車會立即縮窄道路使用；</li> <li>2.加快灣仔繞道建設；</li> <li>3.限制運貨車輛進入中環送貨時間，例如晚上八時後；</li> <li>4.鼓勵各大機構於新開發區，例如天水圍興建大型商業樓宇，多方得益；</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>		2015-12-12 16:43:46
-----	--	--	---------------------

W00020

609	請解決塞車問題先，總就總用方法搵，但係冇樣做到。		2015-12-12 15:21:26
-----	--------------------------	--	---------------------

W00019

608	請先研究如何豁免中西區居民收費! 無理由我住舊區要被收費!		2015-12-12 12:22:44
-----	-------------------------------	--	---------------------

W00018

607	<p>問題1:繁忙時段收費或交通流量超過上限而導致車速降低時開始收費 原因:只係舒緩道路提高平均車速作用</p> <p>問題2:同意 紅磡隧道</p> <p>問題3:商界為本收費機制 香港地方狹小 防止政府濫收或有加有減行為</p> <p>問題4:認同</p> <p>問題5:認同 如果交通流量未超過上限而導致車速降低時可以免費通過 所有政府車輛、公職人員車輛和(FU或FV的中國來港車輛)一律收費 如被發現政府車輛和公職人員車輛違反上述罪狀加一等</p> <p>問題6:以隧道收費方式計算</p> <p>問題7:乙</p> <p>問題8:否 只支持時段豁免</p> <p>問題9:微波通訊科技</p> <p>問題10:我最關注是個人私隱保護 唔知點解決</p> <p>問題11:舒緩道路提高平均車速作用 防止政府濫收或有加有減行為</p> <p>問題12:有需要</p> <p>問題13:參考德國的動態式交通號誌</p>		2015-12-12 12:09:05
-----	---	--	---------------------

W00017

606	tkstheruiteterotiuhfjijtryiyutyiutio5uyyutryjutjhflkjhuty dhgskdskrhelurysfhdhdkbgdkgbd gkdfghkdjghreuityrugkhdjghdjhfdkdnblf nbglkfgjghghtryrtghsgjldgjs;dfgk		2015-12-12 10:42:49
-----	---	--	---------------------

W00016

605	<p>反對!</p> <p>反對實施電子道路收費計劃!</p> <p>有關計劃未能阻止公司私家車及公共車輛如巴士於繁忙時間駛進中環，再者，此計畫會嚴重分化社會，政府不應以金錢來劃分大眾應有的利益，令到高收入人士或大型機構獲得厚待。</p> <p>(個人資料要求保密)</p>		2015-12-12 09:40:50
-----	---	--	---------------------

W00015

604	你地甘樣做係影响我地生計，不如改善隧道收費仲可以改善交通情況啦，或者可以考慮單雙號限行,如果一味要收費我唔到公平何在，有幾人會怕比這些錢嘅但係我們的客人會怕比這些收費而不比生意我們做。	2015-12-12 09:28:45
603	出入收10000元就暢通無阻啦	2015-12-12 00:32:39

W00014

W00013

602	<p>An examination of the advantages and disadvantages of congestion charges:</p> <p>Some cities, such as London have introduced a congestion charge. The aim of a congestion charge is:</p> <p>Reduce congestion. Therefore reduce time wasted and reduce costs for business          Reduce pollution. Fewer cars will lead to less pollution.          Make city centres more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists, which will help increase quality of life.          Raise revenue. The money from congestion charge can be spent on other forms of public transport and increasing alternatives to driving.          Make Drivers pay social cost of driving. Driving in city centres incurs significant external costs on the rest of society. The main external costs include congestion, pollution and accidents. Congestion is estimated to cost the UK economy over £20bn a year in terms of extra costs for business (time wasted) Driving already incurs taxes, most notably, petrol tax. However, petrol tax doesn't discriminate for where congestion is worst. Therefore, councils could place a congestion charge on driving into a certain area at busy times          Reduce Journey Time. This is good for business, but also helpful for emergency services in getting to serious injuries quicker.</p> <p>Arguments against a Congestion Charge</p> <p>Lost Business for firms in the city centre. It is argued that a congestion charge will encourage people to visit out of town shopping centres and lead to a decline in city centres.          Expensive to Administer. The costs of collection a congestion charge is much higher than petrol tax. It requires sophisticated technology and chasing up drivers who don't pay or try to avoid. For smaller cities the administration costs may be prohibitive.          Evasion. Since the congestion charge has been introduced, there has been a growth in the number of false number plates and schemes to try to avoid paying the tax (such as setting up false mini cab firms)          Inequality. A congestion charge is regressive as it takes a higher % of income in tax from the poor.</p> <p>London Congestion Charge</p> <p>The congestion charge has reduced some of London's worst traffic problems. People don't like paying taxes, but neither do people like sitting in a traffic jam. It annoys me how many voters expect solutions to problems without any tax.</p> <p>Evidence from TFI suggests that following the introduction of the congestion charge, traffic fell 15% leading to a 30% improvement in journey time.          It was feared that a congestion charge would lead to more congestion in the area surrounding the congestion zone, however, this hasn't materialised.          The London Ambulance Service reports a tripling in survival rates from cardiac arrests, it attributes this to better machines and also lower traffic congestion.          Other reports are more sceptical of the reduction in traffic volumes. However, London has seen a prolonged growth in traffic volumes. A congestion charge may just reduce the growth of traffic volumes.          The impact on business is debated. However, a study published after the introduction of the charge suggested the impact was mostly neutral, with few businesses feeling it had made even big benefit or damage loss.</p> <p>How Effective Will a Congestion Charge Be in Reducing Demand?</p> <p>If the tax is quite significant, such as £7 per journey, you would expect it to have the effect of reducing demand. However, it is uncertain how much demand will fall by. If demand for driving in this area is inelastic, the higher price will only have a relatively small effect on reducing demand. However, if demand is elastic then there will be a bigger % reduction in demand.</p> <p>There are various factors which will determine the elasticity of demand.</p> <p>Are there alternative modes of transport? e.g. in London, commuters can use the underground, but, in Birmingham there is no underground system. Therefore a congestion charge may be less effective in Birmingham</p> <p>How necessary is it for people to drive in that area? For example, is there good parking on the outskirts of the area? If the main shopping centre is in the zone, people may still need to drive there.</p> <p>Over Time. Overtime the congestion charge may become more effective. i.e. people have time to buy a bike. In the longer term, shops and businesses may relocate outside the congestion charge.</p>		2015-12-11 23:34:36
601	<p>唔好得個講字!!! 試左先, 再修訂~</p>		2015-12-11 23:15:46

W00012

W00011

600	在中區試行3個月，檢討1個月後，再擴大試點地區，如油尖旺。	2015-12-11 23:15:00
-----	-------------------------------	------------------------

W00010

599	可參考新加坡或倫敦做法，行前一步，搶好過原地踏步!!袋住先啦!	2015-12-11 23:13:15
-----	---------------------------------	------------------------

W00009

598	<p>Congestion, in some cities, is more good than bad. And in other cities, it's more bad than good. The tricky part is separating out the good from the bad, a calculation that Sweet has attempted in a paper recently published online by the journal Urban Studies.</p> <p>Often, we look at the first-order costs of congestion, like the monetary value of the time spent sitting in traffic. Sweet has tried to look instead at some of the larger, second-order costs in regional job growth and productivity. Sure, traffic is bad for you while you're sitting in it. But how – and when – is it also bad for the economy?</p> <p>Sweet took data from 88 of the most congested metro areas in the U.S. between 1993-2008, drawing on measures of congestion from the Texas A&amp;M Transportation Institute (yes, he's aware that TTI's methodology is often criticized, but he considers their data the best available). He looked at both a measure of travel delay (in the average annual hours of delay per auto commuter) and travel capacity (in the average daily traffic per freeway lane throughout an entire metro network).</p> <p>Using data from sources like the Census Bureau and Federal Transit Administration, he also tried to control for other factors that might impact economic growth, like the skill and education of the local labor force, the reach of its transit infrastructure, or the density of jobs. This means that a city like Atlanta, for instance, might be economically hindered by freeway congestion, and meager transit service, and the spatial disconnect between jobs and workers. But Sweet's model tries as much as possible to isolate the impact of the congestion.</p> <p>His results, which are a bit counter-intuitive, suggest that higher levels of congestion are initially associated with faster economic growth. But, above a certain threshold, congestion starts to become a drag on growth. Specifically, congestion seems to slow job growth when it gets to be worse than about 35 to 37 hours of delay per commuter per year (or about four-and-a-half minutes per one-way trip, relative to free-flowing traffic). A similar threshold exists when the entire road network gets too saturated throughout the course of the day (for transpo wonks, that's at about 11,000 ADT per lane).</p> <p>"The thresholds make things very complicated," Sweet says. "It means that congestion, in some cities, is more good than bad. And in other cities, it's more bad than good."</p> <p>Sweet says his estimates are "as close to causal as you can imagine." That means, for uncongested cities, that a little more congestion might actually be good for their economies. But why would that be? Sometimes the cost of alleviating congestion is higher than the cost of the congestion itself. A city that has only a little bit of traffic would be wasting taxpayer money paving new lanes of highway. Until congestion reaches Sweet's tipping point, it's economically inefficient to spend resources trying to fix it. Pave new unnecessary highways, Sweet says, and you do more harm than good to the economy.</p> <p>Above that four-and-a-half-minute threshold, however, something else happens: The quality of life of people making those commutes starts to decline. Now, if you have to spend a miserable hour or two five days a week just getting to work, you're either going to require higher wages to compensate you, or you're going to look for another job. And if congestion makes it harder to match the right workers to the best jobs, that's economically inefficient, too.</p> <p>The good news in all of this is that Sweet found no level of congestion so awful that it entirely halts a region's job growth. All of those other variables that he controlled for – the other transportation infrastructure, the demographics, even the efficiency of the local government – matter too much. You'd need an unholy mix of disadvantages on all of those fronts to really stall economic growth.</p> <p>"Detroit is a great example," Sweet says. "They have a perfect storm of a lot of things going on right now. In the study time frame, they were the only region that had any kind of sustained job losses, but that also exceeded these congestion diseconomy levels. But I don't think you could argue that congestion in itself caused Detroit's problems."</p>	2015-12-11 23:13:14
-----	---	------------------------



W00008

597	<p>Our relationship to traffic is pretty simple: We hate it. We also loathe its awful-sounding synonyms, congestion and gridlock.</p> <p>"Without failure, people find it a tremendous inconvenience," says Matthias Sweet, a researcher at the McMaster Institute for Transportation and Logistics at McMaster University. "I've never talked to anybody over a dinner table conversation, or making it late to a meeting, saying 'boy, I'm glad I got stuck in traffic.'"</p> <p>Yet traffic's relationship to the economy of whole metro regions is much more complicated, so much so that researchers haven't entirely explained it. Congestion makes people late to work. It stresses us out before we even get there. Deliveries can't arrive on time. All that gas costs money. But many of the American cities with the worst congestion also have the largest economies. And, to a certain extent, congestion is a sign that an awful lot of people have jobs to get to, which is indisputably a good thing. (Case in point: During the government shutdown, congestion in the Northern Virginia suburbs of Washington noticeably declined, a bittersweet benefit for the region.)</p> <p>Sweet likes to explain this convoluted relationship between congestion and economic growth with an analogy from the oft-analogized film <i>The Good, the Bad and the Ugly</i>.</p> <p>"We all know that it's pretty ugly out there when you're stuck in gridlock, but we have reasons to believe that there might be parts of congestion that are all three of those," he says. "Congestion may be good in that it's an indicator of active and vibrant urban places. Congestion might be bad in so far as it means that access is impeded, freight deliveries aren't able to happen on time, and people are hating life."</p>		2015-12-11 23:11:52
596	講左咁多年，研究又研究，行出第一步先啦！政府!!		2015-12-11 23:11:39
595	Will there be Any Park and Ride enhancement to facilitate existing drivers who switch to use public transportation to approach central instead of driving?		2015-12-11 20:17:02

W00007

W00006

Record List (total records: 555)

idcomment	comment	ip	create_time
594	1onetwo		2015-12-11 17:57:15
593	support please.		2015-12-11 17:18:44
592	Support ERP.		2015-12-11 15:10:34
591	支持ERP		2015-12-11 14:33:41
590	I agreed.		2015-12-11 14:30:34

Page (12 of 12 Pages): [8](#) [9](#) [10](#) [11](#) [12](#)

W00005

W00004

W00003

W00002

W00001