



TRANSPORT AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Members present:

Mr SR King MP—Chair
Mr LL Millar MP
Mr BW Head MP
Ms PE Pease MP
Mr LA Walker MP

Staff present:

Ms M Telford—Acting Committee Secretary
Mr Z Dadic—Assistant Committee Secretary

PUBLIC BRIEFING—INQUIRY INTO THE TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2023

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Monday, 23 October 2023

Brisbane

MONDAY, 23 OCTOBER 2023

The committee met at 9.00 am.

CHAIR: Good morning. I declare this public briefing for the committee's inquiry into the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023 open. My name is Shane King. I am the member for Kurwongbah and chair of the committee. I would like to respectfully acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet today and pay our respects to elders past and present. With me here today are: Lachlan Millar, the member for Gregory and deputy chair; Bryson Head, the member for Callide; Joan Pease, the member for Lytton; and Les Walker, the member for Mundingburra. Trevor Watts, the member for Toowoomba North, is an apology for today.

This briefing is a proceeding of the Queensland parliament and is subject to the parliament's standing rules and orders. Only committee members and invited witnesses may participate in today's 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 remind committee members that the departmental officers are here to provide factual or technical information on the bill. 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 my 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 mobiles phones off or to silent mode.

HICKS, Mr Simon, Acting Executive Director, Heavy Vehicles and Prosecutions, Department of Transport and Main Roads

KADEN, Mr Daniel, Acting Director, Licensing, Automated Vehicles and Registration, Department of Transport and Main Roads

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

ROBINSON, Mrs Joanna, General Manager, Land Transport Safety and Regulation, Department of Transport and Main Roads

ROSE, Mrs Suzanne, Acting General Manager, Passenger Transport Integration, Department of Transport and Main Roads

CHAIR: I now welcome representatives from the Department of Transport and Main Roads. I invite you to make a brief opening statement. After that, we will go to questions.

Mrs Robinson: Thank you for the opportunity to brief the committee today on the Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023. This bill makes a number of amendments to transport legislation. To begin with, I will address some of the major and more significant amendments as part of the bill.

Firstly, the bill makes amendments to support the transition of heavy vehicle regulatory functions to the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. Committee members will be aware that the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator was established in 2013 following agreement from the Commonwealth and most states and territories to provide a consistent regulatory approach for heavy vehicles across the country. The associated heavy vehicle national law commenced in 2014. This national law was adopted in all states and territories other than Western Australia and the Northern Territory.

The NHVR initially relied on state and territory agencies to deliver most of its frontline heavy vehicle regulatory services under service level agreements. This was a transitional arrangement whilst the regulator established a presence in all of the participating jurisdictions. In Queensland that has meant that our transport inspectors, in addition to performing light vehicle enforcement under our

own state legislation, have also been performing heavy vehicle regulatory enforcement activities on behalf of the regulator. Over recent years, the regulator has been undertaking a National Services Transition program, progressively adopting responsibility for direct delivery of heavy vehicle regulatory services from the participating jurisdictions. Queensland is the last jurisdiction to transition under this arrangement.

Firstly, the bill facilitates the transfer of up to 135 full-time-equivalent TMR staff to the regulator. These staff currently perform heavy vehicle regulatory services and they will continue to perform these duties at the regulator. The department will retain responsibility for light vehicle enforcement activities. Following an extensive consultation process with impacted staff and the Together Queensland union, departmental staff will go to the regulator on an entirely voluntary basis. Crucially, the bill will provide for a fair and seamless transition of staff across to the regulator. The bill expressly provides that all accrued rights to leave—such as sick leave, long service leave and recreation leave—will transfer across. It also provides that the transfer of employment will not interrupt an employee's continuity of service. This is critical to calculating staff's entitlement to long service leave and other benefits. The bill also expressly provides that the transfer will not in any way affect the employee's benefits, entitlements or remuneration. What that means is that the bill ensures that no employee will be worse off should they choose to transfer to the regulator.

As a national system employer, the regulator is subject to the Commonwealth's Fair Work Act. The transfer of business provisions within that act will ensure that the relevant state award and enterprise agreement that currently applies to the impacted employees will continue to apply following their transfer to the regulator. The bill goes further, however, and provides additional protections for staff. It does that by preserving the operation of various directives under Queensland's Public Sector Act following the transition. This will preserve transferred employees' benefits, entitlements, remuneration and rights to superannuation, recreation leave, sick leave, long service leave and other forms of leave.

Given the very close working relationship between the state and the NHVR, these reforms will yield efficiencies in the enforcement of both heavy and light vehicle enforcement. Authorised officers of the regulator will also be appointed authorised officers under relevant state legislation. Therefore, in addition to on-road heavy vehicle enforcement, those officers will also be able to check, for example, on heavy vehicle driver licensing requirements, vehicle registration requirements and dangerous goods compliance. The bill will also support post-transition information access arrangements between TMR and the NHVR. This will continue to ensure efficient delivery and maintain quality service outcomes for industry.

The transition of heavy vehicle regulatory functions from the department to the regulator will complete the National Services Transition program. The NHVR will have responsibility for heavy vehicle regulatory services across all participating jurisdictions. Following the transition, the department will focus its resources on delivering light vehicle compliance activities, including vehicle safety, industry accreditation and personalised and passenger transport services. These reforms are an important step in the history of the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator and the significant role that it plays.

Moving on to other provisions, the bill includes a range of road safety amendments to improve the safety of personal mobility devices such as e-scooters, along with bikes and other path users. These proposed changes are the next phase of our e-scooter reforms in Queensland and build on the work that we have done in recent years to improve safety for PMD users and the public. In particular, the bill introduces a new offence for the rider of a PMD or bike to ride without due care and attention on a road related area such as a footpath, bike path or shared path. This offence already applies on roads so this is extending it to road related areas. This ensures that careless riding can be enforced on all relevant infrastructure where PMDs and bikes are often used.

Riding with due care and attention means to be aware of the safety of other road or path users around them. What constitutes an offence will obviously depend on the individual circumstances. For example, it could include someone dangerously swerving in and out of pedestrians on a crowded path or riding at an unsafe speed around a blind corner where pedestrians and other vulnerable users might be present.

The bill will also align post-crash obligations for all drivers and riders to ensure the same rules apply regardless of where the crash occurs. Currently, all drivers and riders are required to stop and render assistance to an injured party in the event of a crash on a road and exchange relevant information such as a name and address details. However, these obligations do not apply consistently to the riders of bikes and personal mobility devices on road related areas such as a footpath or a bikeway. The bill will expand these obligations to ensure that everyone involved in a crash has the

same rights and responsibilities no matter where the crash occurs. It is important to note that these expansions are relatively minor and really largely just fill gaps within the existing framework. Currently, bike riders must stop at the scene of a crash on a footpath and provide their details but are not required to render assistance, like call an ambulance. However, personal mobility device users are currently not required to stop at the scene of a crash on a path. By comparison, drivers of motor vehicles must stop, render assistance and provide details regardless of where the crash occurs.

The bill also introduces protections for vulnerable people who may be unable to exchange information with other people involved in crashes because the disclosure of their personal details may place them at considerable risk. In these circumstances, a driver or rider will be able to withhold their personal information but must report the incident to a police officer, including providing their personal information, to support further investigation for enforcement or insurance purposes. These protections to support the safety of vulnerable people like the victims of domestic and family violence and children will apply on roads and road related areas for all types of vehicles.

This bill also makes amendments to support the recognition of digital driver licences and other digital authorities issued in certain overseas countries. Currently, those digital licences would not be recognised as an authority to drive on Queensland roads. To ensure the integrity of our licensing system, however, we will only recognise those overseas licences that meet the relevant international standard for mobile driver licences or an equivalent standard. This is a forward-looking amendment that recognises technological advancement and will facilitate overseas tourism.

The bill will also introduce a consistent framework of safety duties that apply across road-based public passenger services, including bus and personalised transport services. In addition to general safety duties, the changes will also require operators and booking service providers to have a safety management plan to proactively manage the safety of their services. This framework is based on the general safety duty that was introduced for personalised transport services back in 2017. It also aligns closely with safety duties under the Work Health and Safety Act and heavy vehicle national law, meaning less duplication and red tape for industry.

Before developing the framework, the department undertook significant consultation with a discussion paper titled 'Legislation changes to support Creating Better Connections for Queenslanders' that was released in October last year for a six-week period. It is a modern, risk-based approach designed to reduce prescriptive regulation and allow industry to be more proactive about identifying and managing current and emerging safety risks. This is important in our dynamic and ever-changing environment to ensure passenger transport services remain safe for our customers, workers and the general community.

As part of modernising the regulatory framework for road-based public passenger services, the bill also makes amendments to audit and direction provisions. Audits are a useful tool to allow the department to monitor safety and identify potential noncompliance with relevant transport legislation. When noncompliance has been identified, a written direction to comply can be issued to ensure action is taken to promote safety. There are currently inconsistencies between the audit and direction provisions applying to personalised transport compared with other types of road-based public transport services. As a result, audit and direction provisions have been updated to apply a more modern and consistent approach across all of these services.

The bill will also make technical amendments to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act to clarify existing arrangements. The bill will also allow the Governor in Council to decide the remuneration payable to the general manager of Maritime Safety Queensland. Currently, that remuneration package is limited by the Public Sector Act and this has hampered attempts to attract and retain the best qualified applicants for this important role. These amendments, which arose out of a comprehensive review, will allow the remuneration for the general manager to be set at a level comparable with other senior maritime safety and port regulators.

The bill will clarify that areas of land subject to tidal waters outside of port limits can be included in a priority ports master planned area by amending the Sustainable Ports Development Act. This amendment will remove uncertainty as to the inclusion of land adjacent to port limits due to variations of tidal waters. The delivery of master plans for the priority ports is a Queensland government action to protect the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area.

The bill will also make technical amendments to the Transport Infrastructure Act which will simplify and modernise the way a recipient of a tolling demand notice may nominate another driver to support improved customer outcomes. Court proceedings for tolling offences will also be streamlined by the bill. The Transport Infrastructure Act will further be amended to clarify that online advertising of limited access road declarations can occur as well as to remove unnecessary provisions referring to the repealed Wild Rivers Act.

The bill makes a minor amendment to provisions about offensive advertising on vehicles. The committee would recall that Queensland led the way some years ago to amend the road use management act to allow the department to deregister a vehicle that refuses to remove obscene advertising. These provisions have played a significant role in removing offensive vehicles from our road network. The current legislation provides that complaints against offensive or obscene advertising on a vehicle can be made to the advertising standards bureau. As the bureau has now changed its name to Ad Standards, which is supported by the Ad Standards Community Panel, amendments are to be made to adopt these new titles.

The bill will also rename motorised scooters, to be known as ‘low powered toy scooters’. The aim of that amendment is to clarify the different rules that apply to the different types of devices that are being used on our roads and road related areas. The bill provides an extended evidentiary provision to support the enforcement of certain driver distraction offences. There has been a national agreement on the types of electronic devices that drivers should be expressly prohibited from using while driving. These include, for example: portable devices like tablets and media players; wearable devices like smart watches and smart glasses; and certain devices that are inbuilt or physically tethered to a vehicle or motorcycle helmet. Queensland is currently reviewing the proposed changes. An amendment in the bill will support adoption of these changes into the Queensland Road Rules at a later stage.

Thank you for your time today. I hope that has provided with you some detail and useful background on the bill before the committee. We welcome any questions you might have.

CHAIR: Thank you. Are employees transitioning physically to a different location? Are they still in the same building but just working for someone else?

Mrs Robinson: There are a number of locations that the NHVR will have across the state, in a number of towns. There are some locations where only NHVR will have a presence; there are other locations where TMR and NHVR will have a presence. In some locations the NHVR is looking at particular accommodation within that location but, yes, they will absolutely be in the same city.

CHAIR: I understand the consultation you went through with the Together union to ensure the terms and conditions of someone’s employment—if someone works down the road in Brisbane and suddenly they have to go to Quilpie. Thank you.

Mr MILLAR: I can see that you are all very passionate about road safety. I thank every one of you for that. As a declaration, as the chair knows, I do have an MC licence, a multiple combination licence. I want to talk about inspections. I have previously been told by some people in TMR that transport inspectors have been told to focus on truck intercepts instead of cars. Is that correct?

Mrs Robinson: In some areas there has been a focus on heavy vehicle regulatory services rather than cars, depending on some of the sites. In some of the sites in more regional Queensland, absolutely.

Mr MILLAR: Given private vehicles make up the vast bulk of the Queensland fleet, I would expect that they would be subject to the majority of roadside intercepts. The most recent data I have been able to come across, from February 2022, shows that there were only 582 intercepts for passenger cars and approximately 4,400 intercepts for heavy trailers, trucks, prime movers and road trains. Why are trucks over-represented in these numbers?

Mr Hicks: The inspection of heavy vehicles over time—it has worked with the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. There are many activities that are scheduled across the state with the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator that would inflate those numbers. There are a number of activities and specialised inspections that are done as part of the vehicle inspection program as well. On roadside intercepts we work very closely with the regulator, so when they do a national exercise they are targets. They would potentially be work diaries or overmass breaches. Those numbers would be over-represented.

CHAIR: It is not really relevant to the bill, but I will let you continue.

Mr MILLAR: I think it is a little bit.

CHAIR: Not really this bit of legislation. It is relevant to the Department of Transport and Main Roads.

Mr MILLAR: Absolutely. I respect that, Chair.

CHAIR: If we can just finish up.

Mr MILLAR: What I am trying to get at is: how many accidents on Queensland roads in the last year were caused by defective heavy vehicles versus accidents caused by defective passenger vehicles? Do we have any data on that?

Mrs Robinson: We would have to take that question on notice. We could get you some data on that.

Mr MILLAR: I am happy for it to go on notice.

Mr Mahon: The incidence of defects causing accidents is really difficult to draw out from the data because, obviously, there are a number of different factors that often relate to an accident. The data is relatively low, in relation to both types of vehicles, in relation to the defects that might be found on vehicles. There are also a number of other factors. For example, if someone is fatigued or if someone is not paying attention and they drift onto the wrong side of the road, for example, when they correct a defect might present itself then, when there is an incident, whereas it may not present itself at all if the person is really focused on the task at hand.

I also add in relation to the transition that Joanna and Simon have talked about with the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator, that will enable the regulator to be fully focused on heavy vehicles. Of course, the department can then continue to be fully focused on light vehicles moving forward. When this transition occurs, it will enable us to be far more focused on light vehicles as well as passenger transport vehicles, as mentioned in the opening statement.

Ms PEASE: Thank you very much for coming in and for all of the great work that you do across Queensland. My question is probably to Mr Simon Hicks with regard to the Heavy Vehicle Regulator. In terms of when the transition takes place, if there are any prosecutions underway at the time will they automatically transition over to the national body or will you have to finalise the prosecution and then begin again?

Mr Hicks: In terms of the transition of the prosecution services, we will retain matters on foot as they transition and we will seek to close those matters out as the department. Those cases will not transition across.

Ms PEASE: Are mobility scooters for people with limited abilities being captured in the PMDs?

Mrs Robinson: No. What you are talking about are the motorised mobility scooters for people who might struggle to get around. They are not captured within the personal mobility devices. They are your devices such as e-scooters, e-skateboards, Segways and so on.

Ms PEASE: In my electorate of Lytton we have lovely waterways along the front and we were one of the trial sites for hire scooters. With regard to these devices and people hiring them, is there any onus on the provider—the business that actually runs the purple or the orange scooters—to make sure that the people hiring them are aware of their requirements?

Mrs Robinson: The scooter companies that hire generally have a contract with the local councils. They provide a whole range of stipulations that they put on those companies in order to make them as safe as possible.

Ms PEASE: I guess my question is more about the person who is hiring them, because this bill will be introducing greater requirements on the person using those devices. Is there any responsibility on the company to make sure that the people hiring those devices are aware of the new legislative requirements?

Mrs Robinson: Yes. Any companies that hire out these scooters provide the person hiring them with information about the road rules, what is required of them and what they can and cannot do when they hire the scooters.

Mr Mahon: As part of these reforms we will engage with those hiring companies to advise them of the reforms and the changes and what they mean so that they can do that as well. Equally, we will be doing the normal communications that the department would do around changes of rules et cetera to make sure the community is well aware.

Mrs Robinson: We have a personal mobility device working group. The companies that hire out these scooters are on that, with a whole lot of other stakeholders as well. They are part of any communication. We talk about all of the reforms we are doing through that group, so they are fully aware. As Andrew said, we will make sure communication goes out to everybody.

Ms PEASE: With regard to the changes to the legislation where there will now be a requirement on those other roads, if a hire PMD is involved and they do not stop and provide the information, will the information from the hiring company be available to police, prosecutors or individuals if they have not provided it? To hire the vehicle they have to provide certain information about themselves. Will there be an opportunity, if there has to be a prosecution, to get access to that data?

Mrs Robinson: We have been working very closely with the PMD providers.

Mr Kaden: I just reiterate that we have worked really closely with the share companies. They have been fantastic throughout this process. We worked with them on these particular amendments. In relation to the specific question about information provision, I would expect that normal court processes would apply in the instances of information provision and obviously garnering that from a shared scheme provider. Obviously these reforms strengthen the requirement for individuals to stop and provide that information at the scene of a crash. It was very important that we extended that out to personalised mobility devices.

Ms PEASE: I know how hardworking the share companies are and how they want to work to make sure they provide the safest possible engagement in PMDs.

CHAIR: People own private ones as well. It is a pity the devices do not have—this is more of a comment than a question—something in them so that if they are driven erratically there is a geofenced location of where they are, what they are and you know who is riding them, particularly the shared ones. It could actually flag up an offence by itself with the machine. That would be handy.

Ms PEASE: Whilst with the share companies we can know who has hired them, with those privately owned ones we have no way of keeping a record of who owns them. Are you looking at privately owned devices?

Mrs Robinson: And keeping a record of who owns them? Not specifically. Certainly, registration of PMDs has come up before, just like it has with bikes, but at this stage we are not looking at registration of those vehicles.

Mr HEAD: I have an MC licence as well. Regarding part 2, clause 4 of the bill, which relates to the quorum for board meetings of the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority Act 2016, is this change required because Ms Rachel Hunter is only attending one-third of the meetings as per appendix 1 in the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority annual report?

CHAIR: You are seeking an opinion there, mate. I do not know if the witness can answer that.

Mrs Rose: We will have to take that on notice because it is outside of Transport, but that amendment has been incorporated into our bill.

CHAIR: We are not asking for opinion on why these things are happening but basically just any facts around why it is being amended.

Mr HEAD: What it will achieve would be helpful.

CHAIR: Do you have another question?

Mr HEAD: Yes, thank you, Chair. Because this bill does relate to a shift in resources—further to the question the member for Gregory asked—I was curious if you could also provide statistics on kilometres travelled for heavy vehicle incidents compared to light vehicles. If you could perhaps add the kilometres travelled for different vehicles to relate to those statistics it would be helpful.

CHAIR: If you can go into that detail.

Mr Mahon: The department does not collect data on the number of kilometres travelled by particular vehicles. We can potentially provide estimates. We do not track kilometres travelled per vehicle, so it would be an extremely difficult task for us to try and understand to any level of specificity what that distance might be for heavy vehicles versus light vehicles. There is some general data the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator does collect in relation to incidents and so forth that we might be able to provide.

Mr HEAD: That would be helpful.

CHAIR: You mentioned that in relation to tolling demand notices it would be simplified out to nominate another person. I will not regale you with my story about tolling, but I was just wondering what the simplification will be.

Mr Mahon: That is a really straightforward one. At the moment when you nominate a speeding ticket, for example, you can do that online. You cannot do that with tolling infringements. We will be transitioning that to online to enable consistency. It is in a different act to TORUM, of course, where the speeding tickets are. We are just updating it to get it consistent.

CHAIR: I found that if you loan your trailer to someone and they are tolling it and it obscures the registration plate of the vehicle and the vehicle does not have an e-tag but is set up for vehicle recognition, you get a demand notice.

Mr Mahon: On the trailer, correct.

CHAIR: That was interesting. The trailer cannot be nominated as a vehicle itself because it is not propelled. I do not know if it is a flaw in the system, but it is just something to note.

Mr Mahon: We can take that on notice and raise it with Transurban to see if there is an opportunity there for a transition. I understand when that occurs they will transition to the correct account the vehicle was towing, but we can certainly raise that.

CHAIR: It took a while to track down who owned the trailer. It came that it was my trailer but it was behind another vehicle. There is the fee that comes with tracking and everything. It does not matter; it was not a great deal. I am just noting it.

Mr WALKER: As a former deputy mayor and councillor I can say that Townsville was one of the early trial sites of e-scooters. As you trial these things out of the box, issues arise. There are some rules around using these devices. There are still people who appear to be oblivious to the requirements. I notice that on the scooters there is not much information. It says, 'You must abide by the traffic regulations or the law.' I have noticed that when you walk into an airport a text message will come to your phone saying what is available. I know this is a little bit deeper, but is there education and some ownership by the companies to go to a whole new level of educating visually via text messaging and on the machines themselves? We have international visitors and all sorts of people who could say they are not aware. I want to know what the obligations are on those companies to make sure everybody is well and truly informed as we move forward with insurance as well. It is a big question: educating, information and insurance. There are probably three things in that.

Mrs Robinson: In the communications space we do a whole range of things already to get the road rules out to everybody, including people who own private e-scooters, and that is increasing. We do that via a range of mechanisms, including information at point of sale, for example, including through the company out to users of those PMDs, including billboards. There is a whole range of things we do to communicate, and we will continue to use those mechanisms to communicate. In relation to text messaging directly to users through the companies, we can certainly take that away and talk to the companies about that type of thing.

Mr WALKER: It was more around e-scooter hire companies.

Mrs Robinson: Yes.

Mr Mahon: There are two things most of the companies do now. Physically on the devices they tend to have the high-level rules in a picture to enable people to have a look at that. They also have that information in their app. When you hire the scooter itself, there is a section in their app that talks about the rules. We can work closely with them to make sure that is up to date and that when people check in and hire the device that is really obvious for them. We can look at that.

Mr WALKER: My biggest concern is helmets. They just hop on and go. I continually see that. I am suggesting that it says it on the handlebars. I have had a look and there is nothing there to say, 'You must have your helmet on prior to leaving.' We still see people doubling at speed with no helmets, and it just blows my mind where this is heading in terms of injuries. I just wanted to see what the obligations are with regard to communication. Pictures are good, but I just want to make sure it is highly visible. It seems like a lot of people use them without helmets.

CHAIR: I hired one a little while ago. You have to unclip the helmet before it will take off. The helmet is locked in, and then you have to lock it back in before it will release it.

Mr WALKER: It does not make you put it on your head, though.

CHAIR: No, it does not, but you have to put it somewhere if it is unclipped.

Mrs Robinson: It is a start.

Ms PEASE: Can you elaborate on the amendments regarding sustainable ports and what that will mean to our ports?

Mr Mahon: There are four ports that are master plan ports. Two of those are currently in place and two of those are currently being developed. The amendments are fairly minor and administrative in nature. They address an issue in relation to tidal waters. In a port master planned area, the current master planned area might cover a certain area and say that a certain type of development is enabled in that area, but if there are tidal waters in those areas right now under the legislation technically it does not apply to those areas. If there is a creek or an inlet, different rules would apply and the port master plan would not capture those areas. It is an anomaly in the legislation that we are addressing to make sure it covers that. It does not change the master planned areas and it does not change the process we are going through; it is simply to make sure we address those tidal water areas that come into those master planned areas.

Ms PEASE: Can you name the four ports you are talking about and the two that are and two that are not?

Mr Mahon: Townsville, Mackay/Hay Point, Gladstone and Abbot Point. Townsville and Gladstone are the two that are currently in place; Mackay/Hay Point and Abbot Point are the two that are currently being developed.

Mr HEAD: Regarding heavy vehicle inspection sites across the state, I understand they are on TMR land and managed by TMR. I am curious where the responsibility will lie going forward for the upkeep and maintenance of these sites and also the sharing arrangements. I am assuming it will be TMR. If you are conducting light vehicle inspections across the state, how is that relationship and liaison between the regulator and the department going to work going forward?

Mr Hicks: They are TMR assets currently. With the transition, the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator and TMR will have an agreement or licence agreement to maintain those existing areas where they do those inspections.

Mr HEAD: It will not restrict TMR from being able to conduct light vehicle inspections? I know that most of them are designated heavy vehicle sites, but they are TMR sites that could be used for light vehicle inspection sites as well?

Mr Hicks: Yes, we are also working closely with the regulator to ensure that where we need access to those sites they will be available for the department.

CHAIR: In my electorate on the highway there is a new weighbridge going in, so that will be managed by the Heavy Vehicle Regulator—I never even thought of that—rather than TMR. They are the employees who will transition. I know them.

Mr MILLAR: We have seen e-scooters come in over the last five or six years. There has been a massive change. Is there a state you are looking at that has done this well? Are you working with other jurisdictions? Is there a desire to have a national law agreement on these?

Mrs Robinson: Queensland is leading in this space across Australia. Other jurisdictions are looking to us to see how we are going. We have been talking at a national level about consistency and what that might mean, but a number of states are not where we are at present. Like I said, we are leading across the nation.

Mr MILLAR: I think you are right: anything Queensland does, we do lead anyway. Where are the inconsistencies at the moment with e-scooters? What are the department's major concerns? I have a lot of concerns, but where are you focusing most of your concerns?

Mrs Robinson: We are doing some work around drink riding, for example. We are looking at drink riding and there will be something probably coming through next year. That is an area where we have a lot of focus. That has been something that was picked up as part of the reforms. When we had consultation before the last lot of reforms that was something that would be a focus for us.

Mr HEAD: Regarding changes to the safety duty regulation framework for road-based passenger services, could you outline which road-based public passenger services will now be captured by the requirement to have safety management plans that were not previously?

Mrs Rose: The amendments are proposed to enhance current safety duty laws and apply them uniformly and consistently across road-based public passenger services, so that will include bus and personalised transport. They will also require road-based public passenger service providers to have a safety management plan to identify foreseeable risks and manage passenger transport specific safety. The existing provisions apply to personalised transport, so that is taxis, rideshare and limousine and will extend more broadly to the traditional bus network.

Ms PEASE: You may have just answered that question for me. I was just going to inquire about the personalised transport service. Joanna mentioned it and gave a bit of an overview in her opening statement. Could you elaborate on what that is going to look like? I am sorry, I did not hear your response. I am interested to hear what those changes will mean for personalised transport services particularly. Will that impact rideshare organisations?

Mrs Rose: The short answer is: there is effectively no change for personalised transport because those provisions have been in place for a number of years. This is about extending those provisions so they apply more broadly across road-based public transport services. Buses effectively are the gap. They already exist for rideshare, taxis and limousines, and this is extending them now to bus.

Ms PEASE: What will that include?

Mrs Rose: The amendments are proposed to enhance the current safety duty laws and apply them uniformly and consistently. They will require road-based public passenger service providers to have a safety management plan to identify foreseeable risks and manage passenger transport

specific safety. The proposal is risk-based, it is passenger transport focused and it is intended to align closely with current workplace health and safety and national heavy vehicle laws to the extent that it is feasible and practical. It is also consistent with other jurisdictions such as Victoria and Western Australia.

Ms PEASE: Will that apply to bus charter services as well?

Mrs Rose: Yes.

CHAIR: Are there any final questions? We have about two minutes left.

Mr MILLAR: I have one question—I am not sure if you have answered this already—with regard to cameras for rideshare. Obviously people are concerned about what type of camera they can put into their rideshare. Their concern is that they have to have the standard one, which costs a lot of money. Why is that? Can they just have a normal camera like you see in cars?

Mrs Rose: There are no amendments in the bill that specifically deal with the provisions relating to cameras, but I am happy to answer the question. We have an existing standard in terms of the types of cameras that can be used in personalised transport vehicles, and these are to ensure privacy and the inability of people to tamper with it. They are basically the primary reasons they have to have the approved security type system. There are a number of them across the market and they do vary in price, but they are not as expensive as they used to be.

CHAIR: That will conclude this public briefing. Thank you all for your time; we really appreciate it. A transcript of these proceedings will be available on the committee's webpage in due course. We do have some questions on notice. We have the NHVR data on incidents, the number of trucks versus cars.

Mr Mahon: We will pull together a response for that, Chair.

CHAIR: And why is there an amendment for the Cross River Rail quorum. We are not asking for an opinion, just why. If we can get those answers by 3 pm on Tuesday, 3 November, that would be much appreciated. I declare this public briefing closed.

The committee adjourned at 9.45 am.