



STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr JJ McDonald MP—Chair
Ms JC Pugh MP
Mr WL Chiesa MP (via videoconference)
Mr D Kempton MP (via videoconference)
Mr CG Whiting MP
Mr LP Power MP (via videoconference)

Staff present:

Ms S Galbraith—Committee Secretary
Ms R Duncan—Assistant Committee Secretary

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE SUNSHINE COAST WATERWAYS AUTHORITY BILL 2026

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Wednesday, 18 March 2026

Brisbane

WEDNESDAY, 18 MARCH 2026

The committee met at 10.00 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare open this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill 2026. My name is Jim McDonald. I am the member for Lockyer and chair of the committee. With me here today are: Mr Wayde Chiesa, the member for Hinchinbrook, who is attending via videoconference and substituting for Mr Terry James, the member for Mulgrave; Mr David Kempton, the member for Cook, who is attending via videoconference; Mr Linus Power, the member for Logan, who is also attending via videoconference and substituting for Mr Bart Mellish, the member for Aspley; Ms Jess Pugh, the member for Mount Ommaney, who is substituting for Ms Jonty Bush, the member for Cooper; and Mr Chris Whiting, the member for Bancroft, who is substituting for Mr Shane King, the member for Kurwongbah.

The purpose of today's briefing is to assist the committee with its inquiry into the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill 2026. This briefing is a proceeding of the Queensland parliament and is subject to the parliament's standing rules and orders. Only the committee and invited witnesses may participate in the proceedings. Witnesses are not required to give evidence under oath or affirmation, but I remind witnesses that intentionally misleading the committee is a serious offence. I also remind members of the public that they may be excluded from the briefing at the discretion of the committee. I remind committee members that officers are here to provide factual or technical information. Any questions seeking an opinion about policy should be directed to the minister or left to debate on the floor of the House.

These proceedings are being recorded and broadcast live on the parliament's website. Media may be present and are subject to the committee's media rules and the chair's direction at all times. You may be filmed or photographed during the proceedings and images may also appear on the parliament's website or social media pages. Please turn your mobile phones off or put them on silent mode.

DILLON, Mr Kell, General Manager, Policy, Planning and Investment, Maritime Safety Queensland, Department of Transport and Main Roads

MAHON, Mr Andrew, Deputy Director-General, Policy, Planning and Investment, Department of Transport and Main Roads

CHAIR: I now welcome representatives from the Department of Transport and Main Roads. I invite you to brief the committee, after which committee members will have some questions for you.

Mr Mahon: Good morning, Chair and committee members. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to brief you today and answer your questions on the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill 2026. The Department of Transport and Main Roads has provided a written briefing to the committee containing details of the bill and I would like to highlight a couple of those key features today.

The bill delivers a government election commitment: establishment of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority, ensuring there is cooperation and coordination between the state and local governments around waterways management. The government has committed \$35.6 million over three years to the establishment of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority. The bill establishes the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority as a statutory body to strategically plan for and facilitate the sustainable use, management and development of the Sunshine Coast waterways.

The bill establishes governance arrangements for the authority. The Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority board will report to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. The bill ensures that the authority operates within the Financial Accountability Act and is subject to reporting and review requirements. The bill sets out the functions of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority and requires the authority to develop and implement a waterways management strategy and program. Importantly, the bill mandates consultation with the Sunshine Coast, Noosa and Moreton Bay councils and Maritime Safety Queensland and engagement with the public when developing the waterways management strategy. This ensures that the diverse interests of the community, marine industries and tourism are reflected in the authority's work.

To enable the authority to fulfil its role, the bill amends several key pieces of legislation including the Transport Infrastructure Act, the Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act and the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act. The bill provides a clear framework for the authority to be responsible for public marine facilities such as boat ramps and the Mooloolaba state managed boat harbour as well as aids to navigation and designated channels. The Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill 2026 ensures a clear delineation of responsibilities between the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority and Maritime Safety Queensland, which will remain the statewide maritime regulator. Maritime Safety Queensland will continue to be the regulator and responsible for marine safety and marine pollution requirements in Queensland waters, including speed limits, life jacket rules, licensing, and vessel registration and seaworthiness. MSQ's harbourmasters and general manager powers will continue to be in place, including for maritime emergency management.

While the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will be deciding where and when and under what conditions various waterways activities are permitted, Maritime Safety Queensland and its enforcement partners in the Queensland Water Police and Queensland Boating and Fisheries Patrol will be the on-water presence, monitoring compliance and taking any required enforcement action. Subordinate regulatory amendments are being prepared to cover operational powers for managing public marine facilities, approvals for boat moorings and aquatic events, and the assessment of tidal works development.

In summary, the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill 2026 provides the necessary tools and governance structures to strategically plan for and facilitate the sustainable use, management and development of the Sunshine Coast waterways effectively. The bill ensures that these vital natural assets are managed with significant input from local communities and preserved and enhanced for the benefit of current and future generations. Thank you, Chair and members, for the opportunity to address the committee today. Kell and I are pleased to assist you with any of your questions.

CHAIR: Thank you, I will go to the deputy chair for the first question.

Mr WHITING: Do you want to start, member for Logan, or do you want me to do that?

Mr POWER: I will address my question to Kell Dillon. Specifically, how is the approach of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority different to the Gold Coast Waterways Authority?

Mr Dillon: The two authorities are modelled very similarly to one another. The key difference between the Gold Coast Waterways Authority and the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority is that in the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority model Maritime Safety Queensland will retain all of its compliance and enforcement functions consistent with the rest of the state, whereas the Gold Coast Waterways Authority has some compliance and enforcement functions along with Maritime Safety Queensland. The Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will be much cleaner, clearer and less confusing for the public and agencies as well.

As the deputy director-general just outlined, the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will have responsibility for consultation with the community and maritime infrastructure. They will decide on how various activities will be undertaken on the water such as marine zones and so on, and they will be consulting with Maritime Safety Queensland and our other government agencies for that. For enforcement, compliance and all on-water activities Maritime Safety Queensland will remain in charge of those responsibilities, consistent with the rest of the state.

Mr KEMPTON: The submission says there is no single organisation that is responsible for the management. Are you confident that this authority will have the level of interaction with the community and other agencies, councils and so on to achieve the objectives, or do you think more needs to be done?

Mr Mahon: Firstly, I wish you all the best in Cook over the next few days. There is certainly a lot of terrible weather coming through, so we wish the best for you and the community up there. In answer to your question, yes, at this stage we are obviously going to monitor how we implement and how we manage, between the two departments, so the authority and the department including Maritime Safety Queensland within TMR. The intent with the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority is to ensure that one of their major functions is community consultation and engagement with all of those key inputs, whether that is through local government, whether that is Maritime Safety or whether that is the Queensland police. Whoever is relevant or a stakeholder in a decision or the strategy moving forward, their function requires them to do that consultation. It is an important piece of the set-up of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority, and it is something we will continue to monitor and provide advice to the minister along the way as we implement.

Mr POWER: I want to ask about the dredging budget. We know that \$20 million worth of dredging is underway in the Pumicestone Passage. My understanding is that the dredging itself will continue under the Coordinator-General and, on completion, the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will take over the maintenance of that; is that correct?

Mr Mahon: The short answer is yes. The intention is that that will be transitioned over to the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority to continue to manage. That will be a decision between the relevant ministers, who will determine when that is appropriate and how that will be managed. Dredging will be a key function of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority moving forward so they will be required to continue to monitor dredging at key locations.

Mr POWER: Say there was another weather pattern that brought up a lot of sand into this or another area within the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority's remit. Have any costings been done to determine how that would affect the budget of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority? Would it need to be increased in those circumstances?

Mr Mahon: There will be an element in the budget for the authority to manage dredging but it will be at the smaller scale. If there was something significant like what has happened at the Pumicestone Passage—if that were to occur again down the track or in a different location the authority is responsible for managing—then that would be something the authority would have to bring to government for budget consideration above and beyond their operational budget.

Mr POWER: That could be several multitudes of the current budget.

Mr Mahon: It does depend, obviously, on the scale—absolutely. When you have something of the scale that is occurring at the Pumicestone Passage, \$20 million is significantly more than the operational budget for the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority. If you are looking at a scale of that size, certainly it is much larger than the budget allocation for their operations and dredging operations. That goes for any location where they would need to dredge at a cost that is significantly more than what they have allocated to them. It is the way that it operates now for our department and others. We have a limited dredging budget that we manage. If something significant were to come up that required a really significant investment then that is something we would take through the normal budget process.

Mr WHITING: I have concerns about that. When I was on the Caboolture council I had some experience with dredging in the Pumicestone Passage, that is, the canals of Bribie. The initial capital works were relatively cheap, but the annual budget—and we needed to be allocated an annual budget to do that dredging—was quite substantial. Not only that, there were the ancillary or related structures as well. Surely there must have been some work done already to look at what I think needs to be an annual budget for dredging, because that is going to dwarf any initial capital works that you will be doing.

Mr Mahon: Absolutely, if there are significant budget requirements for dredging then that is something the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will, when they are established, need to raise with government and put through the normal budget process. They will have some budget allocation for dredging. I note the point you make that dredging can be extremely costly. Because you are talking about effectively a natural wonder, often what happens is that it comes back in certain locations. We have seen that at the bar at Mooloolaba, where we have to look at different options and different approaches but they can be quite costly. It just depends on the specific scenario and the specific location.

In this model, dredging will still be required by local governments. They will still need to dredge certain locations. The Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will be responsible for those where there is a marine zone or a key location like the Mooloolaba bar and locations in and out of state facilities like that. There will still be dredging required by local governments where there is not a marine zone, and that is something that will continue.

Mr WHITING: Have you liaised with the Sunshine Coast Council about those costings?

Mr Mahon: We have not spoken about specific costings at this stage. It will continue under their normal remit. On the allocations that those councils have for that type of activity, where they do it—and sometimes it is in those canal estates, for example—they will continue do that and that is not captured in this legislation.

Mr CHIESA: My question relates to how far the authority's boundaries extend on the ocean side and how far up the creeks and canals the authority will have remit.

Mr Mahon: The boundaries are outlined in the legislation in terms of the southern and northern tips, which is fairly straightforward. To answer your question about things like canals and how far the remit extends, I will hand over to Kell, who can explain it in a little more detail. As I mentioned in my previous answer, largely marine zones are the key locations the authority will be responsible for. They will set the marine zones in consultation with a range of other stakeholders, as I mentioned earlier. Key locations like the Mooloolaba bar are really important locations that the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will have to manage and implement. Kell can probably provide a little more detail, if you like, to clarify that answer.

Mr Dillon: It really depends on what we call navigable waters. With creeks and other inlets we have designated navigation areas, and that is really the remit of the agency because it is all about boat access in navigable waters. On the seaward side, state waters extend out to three nautical miles so it would go out to three nautical miles off the coast. Keep in mind that Maritime Safety Queensland retains the role as the maritime safety regulator.

Ms PUGH: I want to circle back to the point the member for Cook made about the single organisation and the management of the body. With the development process for the strategic waterways management strategy, obviously you need to consider community consultation and also environmental and economic impacts. Can you outline for the committee and substitute members the decision-making process when those factors come into conflict? I believe the member also asked about community consultation, in particular, and how you plan to manage that going forward.

Mr Mahon: Certainly as part of the remit for the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority, they will need to consider all of those inputs: as you mentioned, environment and community as well as local government, state government and all of the aspects that provide an input into how they manage that strategy and how they work towards that. Like anything, there will always be a need to find a solution and to find a position that the CEO and the board of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will need to sign off on and, ultimately, seek government approval through the Minister for Transport and Main Roads under the normal remit of responsibility. At times there will be, obviously, a need for them to consider all those elements and there will be parts of those elements that will have a higher priority than others, depending on what the issue is that they are trying to manage.

When you are looking at the strategy across the board, there will be different issues in different locations as well. It is also quite diverse given the environment from the southern end to the northern tip, which is their responsibility. There will be a whole range of factors that they need to consider so all of that consultation will need to be considered and all of that consultation will need to be briefed appropriately around what decision the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority recommends moving forward, making sure they take in all of those aspects along the way.

As Kell mentioned, Maritime Safety Queensland and our department will still be the maritime regulator. The key importance from the Transport and Main Roads perspective will certainly be safety and making sure that aids to navigation, speed limits and all of those sorts of things are considered with a safety lens over the top of them to make sure we are looking after the public as far as the use of the waterways is concerned. Obviously, the department of environment will play a role with their inputs and will be a key player as part of that consultation process. They will have aspects that they need to consider as well.

I probably cannot give you a perfect answer as there is no weighting and there is nothing within there that is more important than anything else. It is combined, pulling all of those things together that they need to be responsible for and, ultimately, the board recommending a position moving forward to government.

Ms PUGH: You have touched on the board process. As far as the establishment of a board goes, can you outline the process for selecting the board? Will the board members be appointed by a minister or by some other mechanism?

Mr Mahon: The board will be appointed by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads—very much the same as the Gold Coast Waterways Authority and other government owned corporations that the minister is responsible for. As we always do as a department, we will provide advice and guidance on the skill sets and the types of things that would be important to that board but, ultimately, the Minister for Transport and Main Roads will make that decision.

There is also the opportunity to have an interim CEO. The intention is to have the establishment of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority by 1 July. That will require appointments to be made prior to that, to commence from 1 July, and there is an opportunity for an interim CEO to be appointed, if the minister sees fit, to help establish the authority and get it operating as quickly as possible.

Ms PUGH: So from 1 July this year they would probably need to have an interim CEO in place?

Mr Mahon: It is an option to have an interim CEO. It is not mandatory and it is not something that has to occur, but it is an option for the minister to consider, yes.

CHAIR: I note that there have been a number of consultations with different departments, and the briefing note says there are no outstanding issues from the interagency consultation. What issues were raised during that consultation? Obviously there will be further consultation through this inquiry so we look forward to other feedback.

Mr Mahon: To the last point you made, we will happily respond to any issues that come up as part of the inquiry process and answer questions that may come up after this morning's session. We have obviously consulted with all of the government departments that play a role. Understandably, the key issue that we need to resolve and make sure is really clear is who is responsible for what.

As Kell Dillon mentioned, the simplest way, in my view, to describe how the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will operate is that they will manage everything in the water—all of the infrastructure and operations within the water; MSQ and the Police Service with the Water Police will manage everything on the water from a compliance perspective. If someone is speeding, if someone is not wearing a life jacket, we and the QPS will continue to manage that from a compliance perspective, but the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority will manage everything in the water—whether that is dredging, installing aids to navigation, setting marine zones and all of those sorts of things. That has been important for us to make really clear in our consultation process and it has been beneficial to our partners and other agencies to have a clear understanding of how it will work.

Mr Power asked a question earlier around the slight differences between the Sunshine Coast and the Gold Coast waterways authorities. Obviously we will look at both as we implement and work towards it, and if we need to make recommendations to government in the future as a department—which we always would—we will continue to do that around the benefits of both models, but they are not vastly different. They are very similar. Certainly, that has been a key part of the implementation. The focus for the Sunshine Coast is to make sure it is clear and easy to understand and that people understand the remit of each of the authorities.

CHAIR: I like that term: in the water and on the water. When you said 'life jackets', it made me flash back to Mr Dillon's comment that life jackets are the seatbelts of the sea.

Mr WHITING: We note that the member for Noosa repeatedly raised concerns about the community consultation involved with this. Can you talk about the work the department has undertaken to communicate with the local community?

Mr Mahon: We have obviously consulted across the government agencies and worked through the development of the bill. Much of the consultation has been certainly done by members of parliament during that process and there have been discussions as part of that process. As mentioned earlier, it was an election commitment that the government made and so it was clear in the community that that was the intention of what they were bringing forward.

As far as consultation with members of parliament is concerned, that is not something the department has done. We have consulted across agencies and at officer level in various locations. We have talked to local governments, of course, along the way and understood some of the challenges and issues. We are aware that there were some issues raised by the member for Noosa, who has raised them with our minister, who has responded to those questions and concerns directly. The department has not engaged in a consultation process with that local member directly on this particular issue.

Mr WHITING: What about the community? You have obviously done that work across agencies, but is consulting with the community part of the work that needed to be done? The member for Noosa has said there is concern about the lack of community consultation that was performed.

Mr Mahon: We have not gone and done public community consultation, hearings or anything like that directly at the local level. That is something that has been done by the local members of parliament within the government and something that was done, obviously, to an extent, in the lead-up to the election, as I mentioned, being an election commitment.

We have talked to councils about the operation and how it would work. Obviously, we have done everything we possibly can to make sure the design of the authority is something that is really easy for the community to understand so they know who to go to if they have questions or concerns in the future. That has been the key focus for us as a department: to make sure it is as clear and

concise as possible and easy to understand so that when the community has a question—for example, who is responsible for dredging, who is responsible for a navigation aid or who is going to come and do enforcement in the water because ‘people are speeding in my canal’—they know who to come to.

Mr WHITING: The departmental brief states that native title for the Kabi Kabi corporation has been determined over the major waterways that will be included in the remit of the authority. What consultation have you done with the Kabi Kabi corporation about the authority?

Mr Mahon: I will double-check with Kell, but I do not believe we have done direct consultation with the Kabi Kabi corporation on this draft bill.

Mr WHITING: Or the native title owners, if not the corporation?

Mr Mahon: No, we have not done consultation directly with native title owners. As mentioned, the consultation has been focused on the state government organisations and local governments.

Ms PUGH: Thank you for outlining the hiring process and the potential for an interim CEO to be in place in about 3½ months. With a temporary CEO potentially coming up, is there a process already underway to select such a person—being that we are talking about that role coming online in just a few short months?

Mr Mahon: We are briefing our minister on the process and recommendations about how to move forward in that space. As I mentioned earlier, it is a decision for the minister whether there is an interim CEO appointed from that date or not. The minister may choose to appoint a board and not an interim CEO and let the board do that process. Alternatively, as I have said, there are provisions that allow an interim CEO. We are briefing appropriately on that process. It is a senior executive role consistent with an SES based role across government, so we would recommend normal process around how we manage that.

Ms PUGH: If we were to have an interim CEO appointed, could there be a situation where—as has happened previously with CEO roles—that interim CEO is then appointed without a further hiring process? Is it a possibility that they do not actually have to interview for that role?

Mr Mahon: The hiring process will be at the discretion of the board. They will need to go through whatever process they see fit in relation to hiring a permanent CEO—if an interim is appointed, that is. We would leave that to the board. As with all authorities under the Queensland government remit or government owned corporations, we would rely on the board to manage that process.

Mr POWER: I note that you said in here that duplication is a concern. The department must have considerable expertise in analysing the need for dredging and safety. If the department determined that there was a need for some kind of, as you said, underwater action but the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority felt that the action was not required, how would that be resolved?

Mr Mahon: When you have something like the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority in place which is responsible for dredging, the department would not play a role in relation to dredging moving forward in those locations. The Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority would take the lead. They would consult with us, we would expect, because we do have some expertise, as you mentioned, in dredging across the state. We would work with them and give them guidance and advice, as necessary. Ultimately, the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority would be responsible for making decisions and recommending to government where dredging should occur if they do not have funding for certain dredging actions. They would take the lead. Ultimately, the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority would be the lead agency making the decision.

Mr POWER: If the department had a strong view on an issue but the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority was not taking action, is there capacity for it to make recommendations directly to the minister?

Mr Mahon: There is, absolutely. There certainly would be scenarios where the minister might ask for our advice on something that looks like a significant safety risk. We could certainly provide guidance to the minister around—

Mr POWER: But no action?

Mr Mahon: Ultimately, the action required would be for the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority. The minister can direct the board and the authority to take certain actions, of course. If he had advice, for example, that dredging needed to occur because of a safety risk at a certain location

and the authority was not taking action, he could certainly direct them to take that action. That might be based on advice that we provided or from another avenue. That would be a normal process. Ultimately, they would be responsible for delivering that.

Mr POWER: In that sense, there is some duplication because the department still has to keep a watchful eye on the safety of boating in Queensland.

Mr Mahon: Yes. Our remit is solely safety and marine pollution in this respect. If we saw an incident on the water or we saw a safety risk in a waterway for which the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority were responsible, that would be the only time we would intervene. If there was no safety risk, we would not provide advice. If we saw a safety risk, we would raise that, as we should in any space, to alert the government and the minister of the day. In the first instance, we would alert the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority directly to make sure they were aware. Given that they have responsibilities in that space, we would expect them to respond and look at plans to make improvements, if need be.

CHAIR: For all of those listening online, we have not determined the location but we have set aside 1 April for consultation in the Sunshine Coast area. Member for Bancroft, do you have a question?

Mr WHITING: What kind of consultation is that, Chair?

CHAIR: It is part of the committee process.

Mr WHITING: The committee consultation—got you.

Ms PUGH: Right before the long weekend—good timing.

Mr WHITING: Absolutely. Going back to the issue of dredging again, the body would be responsible for assessing as well as carrying out that work; is that correct?

Mr Mahon: That is correct. As I said earlier, when I gave my simple rationale and description of the authority, everything within the water will be their responsibility. Dredging is one of those, so they will need to assess, monitor and make decisions around whether or not works need to be carried out.

Mr WHITING: Where they are responsible, the authority would be responsible for getting it done.

Mr Mahon: Correct.

Mr WHITING: If you are responsible for assessing and carrying out the works, how are you going to deal with any environmental issues? If you have to do the assessment and make the decision on what work needs to be carried out, how are you going to manage those potentially conflicting demands?

Mr Mahon: Effectively, they will be managed in the same way we manage them now in Maritime Safety Queensland and the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. Every time dredging needs to be carried out there are environmental considerations to be made. They need to be factored in as to whether or not they are too great to do the dredging. It is the same process. It does not change. It will mean that the authority will be doing that for the area they are responsible for, not Maritime Safety Queensland.

That is carried out for all dredging. Obviously, dredging is sensitive at times and certainly does need to be carried out considering all of those issues. Obviously, an assessment is made about whether or not the environmental issues can be mitigated. It largely depends on other contributing factors like safety, as we have seen at Mooloolaba. It is something of a safety risk and, therefore, action does need to be taken.

CHAIR: Do you have any further questions, member for Logan?

Mr POWER: Yes. There was a recent major oil spill on Moreton Island. These types of pollutant risks are perhaps a state priority. I notice you said that there is a clear line between on the water and below the water, but how would this kind of pollutant issue be handled—say, if the Sunshine Coast had an accidental oil spill from a passing tanker or something like that?

Mr Mahon: Pollution and safety compliance will still be the role of Maritime Safety Queensland, as it is across the whole state. In that scenario, if you had a spill of some description on the Sunshine Coast, then Maritime Safety Queensland would be responsible for taking the lead on response and clean-up to that incident. We would obviously keep Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority in the loop and work with them in relation to that, as we would on the Gold Coast, as well as other key agencies, such as the department of the environment and other agencies that are key in that response. Maritime

Safety Queensland continues to be responsible for compliance on the water and pollution. The waterways authority is managing everything in the water, effectively infrastructure and otherwise, moving forward. There is no change for us there in relation to who would deal with that incident.

Mr POWER: In some cases, it might be recommended that there be dredging of sandbars or clearing of beaches in order to remove pollutants. Is there a crossover in consultation with the works of the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority, or is it simply unilaterally taken by the department? Who does the dredging in that case?

Mr Mahon: The Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority would do the dredging. If you had that really specific scenario you just talked about and there was pollutant in the water and/or pollutant in the seabed or sandbars and it did require dredging, that would be something we would ask the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority to carry out and it might be the case—

Mr POWER: Because you no longer have the powers to do that?

CHAIR: Member for Logan, let the DDG continue, please.

Mr POWER: Sorry, I was just trying to clarify. Remember, Chair, I am on videoconference so I am not certain of—

Mr Mahon: That is okay. The Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority would have the power for that, yes, and we would no longer carry out dredging in that location—so, yes, you are correct. They would have to carry it out. We would recommend, if that was the case, and we would work with them to get them to reprioritise if they had other dredging that was less important or less of an environmental risk because of the pollutant. Obviously, that would be a high risk and a high priority, and we would work with them to make sure that was done first and foremost and then move forward in that space.

CHAIR: I dare say that such a case study that the member for Logan mentioned might be a test case for a disaster management approach at some time down the track. Member for Logan, do you have any further questions?

Mr POWER: No, thanks.

CHAIR: Thank you for your appearance today, DDG and Mr Dillon. There are no questions on notice, so you have no homework.

Mr Mahon: Chair, I want to clarify the question before around the appointments. They are Governor in Council appointments, as per the normal process for the board and the CEO.

CHAIR: Thanks. I declare the briefing closed. Thank you for your appearance today.

The committee adjourned at 10.39 am.