

# **Pilot Green Transport Fund**

## **Final Report On Trial of Hybrid Public Light Bus for Green Minibus Service (Hung Kay)**

(9 February 2024)

PREPARED BY:  
Dr. W.T. Hung

The Monitoring and Evaluation Team's views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Environment and Ecology Bureau (Environment Branch), HKSAR.

## **List of Monitoring and Evaluation Team Members**

**Dr. C.S. CHEUNG (Team Leader)**

Department of Mechanical Engineering  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Dr. C. NG**

Department of Mechanical Engineering  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Mr. K.S. TSANG**

Department of Mechanical Engineering  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Dr. Edward W.C. LO**

Department of Electrical Engineering  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Dr. W.T. HUNG**

PolyU Technology and Consultancy Company Limited  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

**Pilot Green Transport Fund  
Trial of Hybrid Public Light Bus for Green Minibus Services  
(Hung Kay)**

**Final Report  
(Trial Period: 1 April 2021 – 31 March 2023)**

**Executive Summary**

**1. Introduction**

1.1 The Pilot Green Transport Fund (the Fund) is set up to encourage transport operators to try out green innovative transport technologies, contributing to better air quality and public health for Hong Kong. The Fund has subsidized Hung Kay to trial out a hybrid public light bus (HV) for green minibus services.

1.2 PolyU Technology and Consultancy Company Limited has been engaged by the Environmental Protection Department<sup>1</sup> as an independent third party assessor to monitor the trial and evaluate the performance of the trial vehicle. The Assessor regularly visited Hung Kay to collect information for evaluating the performance of the HV and compared it with the performance of a LPG vehicle (GV) which provided the same service in the same areas. The information collected included the said vehicles' operation data, fuel bills, maintenance records, reports on operation difficulties, and opinions of the HV driver, the public light bus passengers and Hung Kay through survey questionnaires.

1.3 This Final Report summarizes the performance of the HV for green minibus services in the 24- months trial as compared with the GV.

**2. Trial and Conventional Vehicles**

2.1 Hung Kay procured one GMI Gemini 19-seats diesel-electric hybrid public light bus (i.e., HV) with gross vehicle weight (GVW) 7,000 kg and cylinder capacity 2,800 cc for trial. One Toyota 16-seats LPG public light bus (i.e., GV) of GVW 4,350 kg cylinder capacity 4,104 c.c. operating in the same service areas was assigned for comparison with the HV.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Administration of the New Energy Transport Fund was migrated to the Environment Branch of the Environment and Ecology Bureau [EEB (Environment Branch)] since 1 January 2023 after internal re-organisation of EEB (Environment Branch) and EPD.

2.2 Both HV and GV were used for green minibus services serving a fixed route 22M between Kwun Tong MTR station and Lok Wah South Estate. They provided services 24 hours everyday, 365 days per year.

2.3 Key features and photos of the HV and GV are in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 respectively.

### 3. Trial Information

3.1 The trial started on 1 April 2021 and lasted for 24 months. Hung Kay was required to collect and provide trial information including the distance travelled, fuel consumed, fuel cost as well as costs and downtime associated with scheduled and unscheduled maintenance of the HV. A similar set of data from the GV was also required. In addition to the cost information, reports on maintenance work, operational difficulties and opinions of the driver, passengers and Hung Kay were collected and provided to reflect any problems of the HV.

### 4. Findings of Trial

4.1 Table 1 summarizes the statistical data of the HV and GV. The average fuel economy of the HV was 0.011 km/MJ (19%) higher than that of the GV. However, since the market fuel price of diesel was higher than that of LPG and the HV carried 3 more passengers than the GV hence with a higher loading, the average fuel cost of the HV was higher than that of the GV by HK\$4.40/km (144%). When the fuel price discounts were taken into account, the average fuel cost of the HV would be about 26% higher than that of the GV. There were three scheduled maintenances for HV but no fee was incurred under warranty. The HV had one unscheduled maintenance unrelated to the vehicle performance and thus was excluded in the cost comparison, The GV had two scheduled maintenances; the average total operating costs of the HV was about 99% higher than that of the GV. When the fuel price discounts were taken into account, the average total operating cost of the 19-seat HV would be about 2% lower than that of the 16-seat GV only.

Table 1: Key operation statistics of each vehicle (1 April 2021 – 31 March 2023)

		<b>HV</b>	<b>GV</b>
Total mileage (km)		51,101	59,172
Average daily mileage (km/working day)		86	82
Average fuel economy	(km/litre)	2.52	1.38
	(km/MJ) <sup>[1]</sup>	0.070	0.058
Average fuel cost (HK\$/km) <sup>[2]</sup>		7.46	3.06
Average total operating cost (HK\$/km) <sup>[3]</sup>		7.46	3.75
Downtime (working day) <sup>[3][4]</sup>		4	4

<sup>[1]</sup> Assuming lower heating value of 36.13 MJ/litre for diesel fuel and 23.67 MJ/litre for LPG.

<sup>[2]</sup> The market fuel price was used for calculation.

<sup>[3]</sup> Maintenance due to incident not related to the performance of the vehicle was not included for comparing the performance.

<sup>[4]</sup> Downtime refers to the equivalent number of working days in which the vehicle is not in operation due to maintenance, counting from the first day it stops operation till the day it is returned to the operator.

4.2 HV had three scheduled maintenances and one unscheduled maintenance incurring 4 days of downtime while GV had two scheduled maintenances incurring 4 days of downtime; the utilization rate was 99.5% for both HV and GV.

4.3 To remove the effect of seasonal fluctuations, 12-month moving averages are used to evaluate the trend of the HV's fuel economy. The results show that fuel economy of the HV had no sign of deterioration.

4.4 The carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2e</sub>) emission from HV was 56,196 kg while that from GV on HV mileage would be 62,158 kg. There are reductions of 5,962 kg CO<sub>2e</sub> emissions (10%) by using HV. Therefore, the adoption of HV had environmental benefit in this trial.

4.5 The HV drivers had no problem in operating the HV and felt the HV was more environmentally friendly compared to the GV. The passenger felt that the air was cleaner within the HV. Hung Kay was satisfied with the performance of the HV and did not detect any deterioration in the performance of the HV.

## **5. Summary**

5.1 In the 24-month trial period, the average daily mileage of the HV was 86 km, while that of the GV was 82 km. Taking the fuel price discounts into account, the average fuel cost and the average total operating cost of the HV was about 26% higher but 2% lower than that of the GV respectively. Furthermore, the HV had 19% higher average fuel economy than that of the GV and carrying 3 more passengers. There was 5,962 kg CO<sub>2e</sub> emissions (10%) reduction by using HV as compared with the GV.

5.2 Excluding the downtime of vehicles unrelated to the performance due to the scheduled and unscheduled maintenances, the HV and GV both had 4 days downtime in the 24-month trial period, the utilization rates of the HV and the GV were both 99.5%.

5.3 No sign of deterioration in the fuel economy of the HV was observed in the trial.

5.4 In the 24-month trial period, the operation of the HV was smooth. The HV drivers, passengers and Hung Kay were satisfied with the performance of the HV and felt that it was more environmentally friendly.

## Appendix 1: Key Features of Vehicles

### 1. Trial HV


<b>Registration Mark:</b>	<b>NR6864</b>
Make:	GMI
Model:	Gemini
Class:	Public Light Bus
Gross vehicle weight:	7,000 kg
Seating capacity:	driver + 19 passengers
Cylinder capacity:	2,800 cc (diesel)
Year of manufacture:	2018

### 2. GV for Comparison

<b>Registration Mark:</b>	<b>LX5233</b>
Make:	Toyota
Model:	BZB40RZCMSCYY
Class:	Public Light Bus
Gross vehicle weight:	4,350 kg
Seating capacity:	driver +16 passengers
Cylinder capacity:	4,104 cc (LPG)
Year of manufacture:	2007

## Appendix 2: Photos of Vehicles

### 1. Trial HV



2. GV for comparison



Front view



Right side view



Left side view



Rear view