

Pilot Green Transport Fund

Interim Report

On

Trial of Hybrid Public Light Bus for

Green Minibus Service

(Ma Shui Hing)

(7 July 2022)

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 Environmental Protection Department, 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. KS Tsang

Department of Mechanical Engineering
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Dr. Edward WC 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
(Ma Shui Hing)**

**Interim Report
(Trial Period: 1 July 2021 – 31 December 2021)**

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. Ma Shui Hing was approved under the Fund for trial of one plug-in electric and diesel hybrid light bus for providing green minibuses in Kwun Tong. Through the tendering procedures stipulated in the Agreement signed with the Government, Ma Shui Hing procured one GMI Gemini 19-seats public light bus hybrid vehicle (HV) for trial.

1.2 PolyU Technology and Consultancy Company Limited has been engaged by the Environmental Protection Department as an independent third party assessor to monitor the trial and evaluate the performance of the trial vehicle. Ma Shui Hing assigned a Toyota LPG 16-seat public light bus (GV) as the conventional counterpart for comparison with the HV.

1.3 This Interim Report summarizes the performance of the HV in the first six months of the trial as compared with its conventional counterpart, i.e. the GV.

2. Trial and Conventional Vehicles

2.1 Key features of the HV and GV are in Appendix 1 and their photos are provided in Appendix 2. Both vehicles were used for public light bus services serving a fixed route 22M between Kwun Tong MTR station and Lok Wah South Estate. The HV's gross vehicle weight (GVW) was 7,000 kg with 2,776 cc cylinder capacity. The GV's GVW was 4,350 kg with 4,104 c.c. cylinder capacity.

3. Trial Information

3.1 The trial started on 1 July 2021 and would last for 24 months. Ma Shui Hing was required to collect and provide trial information including the mileage, 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 Ma Shui Hing 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 the GV. The average fuel economy of the HV was 0.012km/MJ (20%) higher than that of the GV. However, since the market fuel price of diesel was much 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\$3.65/km (121%). If the fuel price discount was taken into account, the average fuel cost of the HV would be about 16% lower than that of the GV. The HV had no scheduled maintenance but one unscheduled maintenances yet no charge was incurred within the warranty period, whereas the GV had no scheduled or unscheduled maintenance. Thus, the average total operating costs were the same as the average fuel costs.

Table 1: Key operation statistics of each vehicle (1 July 2021 – 31 December 2021)

		HV	GV
Total mileage (km)		19,653	20,473
Average daily mileage (km/working day)		107	111
Average fuel economy	(km/litre)	2.57	1.39
	(km/MJ) ^[1]	0.071	0.059
Average fuel cost (HK\$/km) ^[2]		6.67	3.02
Average total operating cost (HK\$/km) ^[3]		6.67	3.02
Downtime (working day) ^{[3][4]}		0.5	0

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

^[2] The market fuel price was used for calculation.

^[3] Maintenance due to incident not related to the performance of the vehicle was not included for comparing the performance.

^[4] 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 During this reporting period, the utilization rates of HV and GV were 99.7% and 100.0% respectively.

4.3 The monthly average fuel economy of the HV ranged from 2.32 to 3.12 km/litre in the first 6 month of trial. There was no indication on the deterioration of the HV performance.

4.4 The HV drivers had no problem in operating the HV and felt the HV was more environmentally friendly compared to the GV. The passengers felt that the air was cleaner within the HV. Ma Shui Hing was satisfied with the performance of the HV and did not find any deterioration in the performance of the HV.

5. Summary

5.1 In the first six months of the trial, the average daily mileage of the HV was 107 km, while that of the GV was 111 km. Taking into account the fuel price discount, the average fuel cost of the 19-seat HV was about 16% lower than that of the 16-seat GV, and it had 20% higher average fuel economy than that of the GV even carrying 3 more passengers. The HV had no scheduled maintenance but one unscheduled maintenance yet no charge was incurred within the warranty period, whereas the GV had no scheduled or unscheduled maintenance. Thus, the average total operating costs were the same as the average fuel costs. The utilization rates of HV and GV were 99.7% and 100% respectively.

5.2 The HV drivers, passengers and Ma Shui Hing were satisfied with the performance of the HV and felt that it was more environmentally friendly.

5.3 The findings only reflect the performance of the HV in the first six months of the trial. The performance and reliability of the HV will be continuously monitored in the 24 months of the trial.

Appendix 1: Key Features of Vehicles

1. Trial HV

Registration Mark:	EY7853
Make:	GMI
Model:	Gemini
Class:	Public Light Bus
Gross vehicle weight:	7,000 kg
Seating capacity:	driver + 19 passengers
Cylinder capacity:	2,776 cc (diesel)
Year of manufacture:	2020

2. GV for Comparison

Registration Mark:	HV2203
Make:	Toyota
Model:	COASTER LPG SWB
Class:	Public Light Bus
Gross vehicle weight:	4,350 kg
Seating capacity:	driver + 16 passengers
Cylinder capacity:	4,104 cc (LPG)
Year of manufacture:	2014

Appendix 2: Photos of Vehicles

1. Trial HV



Front view



Right side view



Left side view



Rear view

2. GV for Comparison



Front view



Right side view



Left side view



Rear view