

FRIDAY, 27 JULY 2018

ESTIMATES—TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE—TRANSPORT AND MAIN ROADS

Estimate Committee Members

Mr SR King (Chair)
Mr TJ Sorensen
Mr CE Boyce
Mr RI Katter
Mr BJ Mellish
Mrs JR Miller

Members in Attendance

Mr SJ Minnikin
Mr MC Berkman
Mr MJ Hart
Mr JP Langbroek

In Attendance

Hon. MC Bailey, Minister for Transport and Main Roads
Ms T van Alphen, Chief of Staff

Department of Transport and Main Roads

Mr N Scales, Director-General

Queensland Rail Limited

Mr N Easy, Chief Executive Officer

Far North Queensland Ports Corporation Limited (trading as Ports North)

Mr C Boland, Chief Executive Officer

The committee met at 9.00 am.



CHAIR: Good morning. I declare this hearing of estimates for the Transport and Public Works Committee open. I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which our parliament stands. My name is Shane King, member for Kurwongbah and chair of this committee. The other committee members with me here today are: Mr Ted Sorensen, member for Hervey Bay and deputy chair; Mr Colin Boyce, member for Callide; Mr Robbie Katter, member for Traeger; Mr Bart Mellish, member for Aspley, and Mrs Jo-Ann Miller, member for Bundamba. The committee has granted leave for non-committee members to ask questions at its hearing today so other members may be present over the course of the proceedings.

Today the committee will consider the Appropriation Bill 2018 and the estimates for the committee's areas of responsibility. I remind everyone present that any person may be excluded from the proceedings at my discretion as chair or by order of the committee. The committee has authorised the hearing to be broadcast live, televised and photographed. Copies of the committee's rules for media coverage of proceedings are available from the secretariat. I ask that mobile phones or other electronic

devices be turned off or switched to silent mode. Also, I remind you that food and drink, other than water, are not permitted in the chamber.

The committee will examine the portfolio areas in the following order: Transport and Main Roads from 9 am to 11 am and from 11.30 am to 1.15 pm; and Housing, Public Works, Digital Technology and Sport from 2.15 pm to 4.15 pm and from 4.45 pm to 6.30 pm. The committee will now examine the proposed expenditure in the Appropriation Bill 2018 for the portfolio areas of the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. On behalf of the committee, I welcome the minister, the director-general, departmental officers and members of the public to the hearing. The committee will examine the minister's portfolio until 1.15 pm and will suspend proceedings for a break between 11 am and 11.30 am. I welcome the visiting member present, Mr Steve Minnikin, member for Chatsworth. He is the only visiting member here at this stage but there will be others coming along.

I remind those present today that the committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. It is important that questions and answers remain relevant and succinct. The same rules for questions that apply in parliament also apply in this hearing. I refer to standing orders 112 and 115 in this regard. Questions should be brief and relate to one issue and should not contain lengthy or subjective preambles, argument or opinion. I intend to guide proceedings today so that relevant issues can be explored fully, without imposing artificial time limits, and to ensure there is adequate opportunity to address questions from government and non-government members of the committee and other non-committee members. For the benefit of Hansard, I ask departmental officers to identify themselves the first time they answer a question referred to them by the minister or the director-general.

I now declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio area of Transport and Main Roads open for examination. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

Minister, if you wish you may make an opening statement of no more than five minutes.

Mr BAILEY: Good morning, Chair, committee members, other members and officials. During the Palaszczuk government's last term, in Transport and Main Roads we had 37 election commitments and we delivered on all of them. Eight months into our second term, we have already delivered 43 of our 67 election commitments. For the third year in a row, we are delivering a record investment via QTRIP—a \$21.7 billion over-four-year program of transport and roads infrastructure supporting, on average, 19,200 jobs. Funding exceeds the previous QTRIP by \$700 million, with a 10 per cent increase in funding from the Palaszczuk government compared to last year which offsets a 6.2 per cent cut by the federal government in Queensland.

Major projects in construction include upgrades to the Ipswich Motorway, the Mackay Ring Road, the Gateway arterial north, the Hann Highway, the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing, the Peninsula Developmental Road in Cape York, Riverway Drive, the Warrego Highway and of course two M1 upgrades—to the Gateway merge and from Varsity Lakes to Mudgeeraba. Not one dollar was spent on new M1 upgrades under the previous LNP government, whereas this government has now fully funded four upgrades—that is correct; four upgrades—on the M1. We have committed \$889 million to accelerate works, including the Eight Mile Plains and Daisy Hill upgrade, the extension to the busway to Springwood, six-laning to the border between Varsity Lakes and Tugun to follow straight after the two M1 upgrades underway now, and we are funding the Oxenford exit 57 interchange upgrade.

This financial year we will see construction start on the Smithfield bypass and the Cairns southern access Bruce Highway upgrade and targeted road safety upgrades in many places, including Morayfield and Beerburrum roads. Last year we committed to a new future proofing the Bruce Highway policy, where we will invest \$10 million over two years to develop a 15-year vision and rolling five-year action plans. We remain committed to the \$8.5 billion 10-year Bruce Highway upgrade program, including important projects like the \$1 billion Cooroy to Curra section D upgrade and the Caloundra Road to Sunshine Motorway upgrade on the Sunshine Coast.

We are already delivering the Nambour to Beerburrum rail duplication, with \$550 million committed in joint funding. More station accessibility upgrades are funded, with design underway for Auchenflower, Cannon Hill, East Ipswich, Fairfield, Buranda, Loganlea, Albion and Dakabin stations and major construction starting soon on Strathpine, Morayfield and Boondall stations. We will build park-and-rides at Springfield Central, Geebung, Lindum, Virginia, Darra, Salisbury and Lawnton rail stations and at Greenbank and Eight Mile Plains bus stations. There is \$53 million allocated for the Northern Transitway between Kedron and Chermerside to give buses priority without losing lanes to other

traffic, and there is \$22 million for the Eastern Transitway which will improve bus travel times on Old Cleveland Road.

The Commonwealth Games success was underpinned by the Palaszczuk government's transport plan. The largest sporting event in Australia for a decade saw our transport plan provide more than 5.3 million trips, with 2.3 million bus trips, 1.1 million light rail trips and Queensland Rail estimated total passenger trips of more than 600,000. We delivered despite the predictable doomsday scaremongering from the usual suspects. We delivered because the Palaszczuk Labor government invested almost a billion dollars in Gold Coast's transport network. We duplicated the Gold Coast rail line between Coomera and Helensvale, invested \$160 million in key Gold Coast road upgrades and of course built the Gold Coast Light Rail stage 2 in 18 months flat.

We are applying the same approach to fixing the mess we inherited with the trains. We are implementing all 36 recommendations of the Strachan inquiry, and 18 are already completed. The rail system has been stabilised and it is gradually improving. For the last year, Queensland Rail has delivered more than 95 per cent of its services on time. While not one train driver started training in the entire last year of the last LNP government, since October 2016 some 90 new drivers and 216 new guards have been trained and are now in service—a net gain of 43 drivers to date. More drivers will start their training in 2018 than under the entire term of the previous LNP government.

Under our government, Queensland Rail has pursued an external recruitment drive. More than 10,000 applications were received, and external recruits started training as guards last month. I am also pleased to report to the committee that last Friday letters were sent notifying 37 people that they were successful external candidates to join Queensland Rail as new train drivers.

It is also pleasing to see a 5.5 per cent increase, with 2.4 million additional public transport trips in the latest TransLink Tracker for quarter 3 of January to March, with an increase in public transport patronage across all modes. Thank you for the opportunity to make an opening statement today and I am happy to take questions from the committee.

CHAIR: Thank you, Minister. We will now commence questioning. I call the member for Hervey Bay to question or delegate.

Mr SORENSEN: I will ask the shadow minister to ask questions.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you, Mr Chair. My question is to the minister. I refer to the Service Delivery Statements, the capital program, on pages 3, 7 and 24 dealing with projects on the Bruce Highway. I ask the minister to provide the terms of reference for the Bruce Highway Trust.

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. The Bruce Highway Trust is an election commitment of the Palaszczuk government from the November election last year. We are committed to the future of the Bruce Highway. The current 10-year program, joint with the federal government, is halfway through so we are looking to the future beyond that program of what we need to upgrade the Bruce Highway. It is the Palaszczuk Labor government's very clear commitment that we would like to see an increase in investment in the Bruce Highway. Currently, on average about \$850 million per year is going in in joint funding. We would like to see that increase to \$1 billion per year. The Bruce Highway Trust is designed to take the politics out of some of the Bruce Highway funding.

I was disappointed to see the federal government remove some funding from the Bruce Highway program contingency fund and spend it elsewhere. I think that is a dangerous precedent because the Bruce Highway is absolutely critical to our economy and to regional communities right the way up the coast. What we proposed is the Bruce Highway Trust policy, which we are negotiating with the federal government around, to look at a future vision beyond the current program. We have engaged with Mr Peter Garske, the former CEO of the Queensland Trucking Association, who has agreed to chair that trust. We would like to see greater buy-in from the federal government to the trust because what we would like to see is a 15-year vision to add to the current program, with rolling five-year action plans, starting from 2019-20. What we have seen already is a 45 per cent average reduction per year in the number of fatalities based on the five years of investment by the state government and the federal government. We have also seen a reduction of 11 per cent average per year in the number of serious injuries since the program began in mid-2013 in comparison to crash records from just the year before.

This is part of our commitment. We want to be looking at the Bruce Highway not just for the next five years but for the next 15 years. We want to see good, evidence based policy. We want to take out some of the politics that is starting to emerge. We think it is a very good way forward and we look

forward to further engagement with the federal government in relation to our election commitment to establish the trust.

Mr MINNIKIN: Minister, could you please advise the committee how many meetings the trust has had to date?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. As I just outlined in my previous answer, I have raised this matter with the Deputy Prime Minister and we are continuing to negotiate with them. It is ideal, of course, that this be an agreement with the federal government so that it is across levels of government, and that process is continuing. I urge the federal government to take a positive approach to the Bruce Highway. I certainly hope that all honourable members, particularly those on the committee here charged with this area, would support me in that process because we want to see increased investment in the Bruce Highway, not just from us but also from the federal government. That negotiation is continuing with them.

Mr MINNIKIN: So the answer to the question is nil?

CHAIR: No. The minister did answer the question. Did you have another question?

Mr MINNIKIN: Yes, please. My next question is to the CEO of Queensland Rail. Mr Easy, thank you for your time this morning. I refer to page 15 of the Service Delivery Statements relating to 'passenger transport services' and 'supporting public transport patronage', as well as page 27, 'total expenses'. It is now over 18 months since Labor's rail fail—

CHAIR: I will just pull you up. Could you please remove the imputation?

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you, Mr Chair, for your guidance. I appreciate it. Mr Easy, I will repeat. It is now over 18 months since there were major problems on the passenger network in South-East Queensland. I ask: what date will Queensland Rail have finally fixed the trains?

Mr Easy: I thank the honourable member for the question. Queensland Rail is committed to implementing all of the recommendations from the Strachan commission of inquiry, with 18 of those recommendations having been implemented to date. We are seeing real and tangible benefits as a result of those recommendations that have been implemented and the further work we are doing to close those recommendations out over time.

002 The first focus has been on stabilisation of the services. We have seen that over 95 per cent of our services are running on time and we have also provided over 99.7 per cent of our services under our current timetable. We have a timetable that delivers 7,828 services per week. That timetable has been delivered reliably and sustainably, and that is our intention moving forward.

We have also undertaken a very extensive and large recruitment program, which is the implementation of one of the recommendations of the Strachan inquiry. We are now running eight times the number of trainees in our programs for recruitment to increase the supply in the organisation. We have made good progress to recruit and train a pipeline of additional drivers and guards, with 90 drivers and 216 guards coming into supply since October 2016. That is a net increase of 43 drivers.

We do understand our customers wanted timetable improvements, and we are committed to increasing services as soon as we are in a position to do so. We continue to work hard to implement the recommendations of the Strachan commission of inquiry and we will continue to focus on reliable, sustainable services. We have seen additional improvements in the recent June-July holiday period; there was no downgrade of services. That was an identified stress period. If we turn back to 12 months ago, the timetable was reduced and the number of services was fewer. That is a very good indication of stabilisation. It is a good indication of the resources that are now being fed into the organisation through the pipeline of training and recruitment that is supporting the delivery of our services.

Mr MINNIKIN: Mr Easy, my question was: at what date will Queensland Rail finally fix the trains? I appreciate your response, but the specific information I am looking for is an approximate date when the existing chaos on the passenger network will be fixed.

Mr Easy: If you are referring to restoration of the timetable, we are very focused and committed to restoring our services. It is important to understand that restoring the timetable involves a number of different variables and a number of different inputs, and that is a complex consideration. What does need to be taken into account is the interconnectivity between rolling stock availability, stabling capacity and management, train crew paths and crewing requirements. These matters cannot be considered in isolation. We will continue to recruit and train drivers. We will continue to recruit the supply of resources into the organisation. When we are in a position to increase the services, we will do so.

Mr MINNIKIN: There is no date, but I appreciate the response. Thank you. I have a further question through the chair to the CEO of Queensland Rail. Mr Easy, can you advise this committee of the modelling of the impact that the upcoming two half-hour breaks for drivers under the new heads of agreement, set to commence on 1 February next year, will have on train crew scheduling?

Mr Easy: You pointed out that there is a memorandum of understanding in relation to two meal breaks. Two meal breaks is a condition contained within the enterprise agreement. The MOU indicates that that will be implemented no later than 1 February 2019. That does involve supporting the timetable through the provision of our train crew, and the modelling will enable us to provide and implement that provision under the enterprise agreement.

Mr MINNIKIN: Whilst I appreciate the response, do you have any modelling to show what the impact will be of those two half-hour breaks in relation to scheduling and rostering given the constraints on the system as it stands at the moment?

Mr Easy: We have done modelling and assessment of the consequences of the two meal breaks. When we implement the two meal breaks there will be no reduction in our timetable and there will be no impact on the services that we are delivering.

CHAIR: Any further questions?

Mr MINNIKIN: I have one further question in this bracket. Mr Easy, in terms of driver recruitment, back in October 2016 when 472 weekly services were cancelled, there were 478 train drivers. Some 20 months later the net increase in drivers—this was as at May this year—was 36. It has now been pointed out—there has been a bit of an increase on that as at today's date—that this is just ahead, notwithstanding the latest information provided by the minister today, of the natural attrition rate. Can the committee be advised when the driver supply will actually meet the number required for a restored timetable and what impact it will have on service operations when the first externally recruited driver starts driving trains?

Mr Easy: I thank the honourable member for the question. External recruitment has advanced since the advertisement nationally for train crew, which occurred in August of last year. We have made significant progress in relation to that, and we had 10,000 applicants in that process. Guards have already commenced schools—on 4 June—with a second school to commence on 30 July, and 36 drivers have been issued letters; they are provisional offers. The schools that are scheduled for 2018 are full and we are expecting those drivers to commence schools in 2019. You can appreciate that the training program takes a period of time.

The Strachan commission of inquiry made a recommendation in relation to streamlining training. At that time it was pointed out that the duration of training was an average of 18 months and at times that was up to 24 months. We now have an average duration of training which is 13 months. We have made quite a lot of improvements around the program, the delivery of the program and streamlining training to ensure that we get the right people in our network to drive safely and to provide reliable services to the community.

Mr MINNIKIN: I have one more question in relation to rail, if you do not mind, Mr Chair.

CHAIR: Certainly.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you. I appreciate your indulgence, Mr Chair. My question is actually to the CEO of Queensland Rail again. I refer to page 15 of the SDS and Passenger Transport Services. Can you advise this committee of the number of Deloitte consultants working within Queensland Rail and the project management office providing guidance on implementing the recommendations of the Strachan report, the cost of these consultants for the last financial year and the estimate for the current financial year?

Mr Easy: Deloitte is a consultant that was appointed following the Strachan commission of inquiry and the recommendations. From time to time the organisation does bring in consultants to provide additional expertise and support. One of the key recommendations from the commission of inquiry was to introduce long-term forecasting and to develop a model which enables us to consider the resources and what is required to support service delivery. They were a key part of the expertise that was brought into the organisation to assist our people to develop an appropriate model for forecasting. They have provided assistance and services by working with our people in implementing the commission of inquiry recommendations. In terms of the costs associated with Deloitte, in the 2016 financial year—I am just checking the costs for a moment. The cost in the last financial year for Deloitte would be \$15.37 million.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you, and the current financial year estimate?

Mr Easy: I would have to get that figure for you if I can find that answer for you before we conclude the proceedings.

Mr MINNIKIN: Through the chair, may I ask that that be provided at some stage?

CHAIR: The CEO said he would try to get it to us before the end of these proceedings. If not, we will ask—

Mr MINNIKIN: I appreciate that, Mr Chair. Thank you.

CHAIR: Any further questions?

Mr MINNIKIN: Actually there are.

CHAIR: I was going to go to the member for Traeger, unless you have one on this line.

Mr MINNIKIN: I do.

CHAIR: Continue then.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you, Mr Chair, I appreciate your chairing. My question is to the Director-General of Transport and Main Roads. With respect to page 15 of the Service Delivery Statements and Passenger Transport Services, I ask: in light of the drop in South-East Queensland rail patronage from about 57.9 million in the 2007-08 financial year to an estimated 52.69 million for 2017-18, when will passenger services across Merivale Bridge reach capacity?

Mr Scales: The Merivale Bridge that crosses the river has a capacity of 24 trains an hour. There is a major investment called Cross River Rail which will give us a second crossing, also with 24 trains per hour. I would have to come back, through the minister and the chair, and take that on notice because I will have to work out what the capacity constraints would be given the current rate of increase because it has actually gone up. It was running at about 2½ per cent; it is now running at about three per cent on the railway. The railway is actually attracting and retaining more people. In the last financial year it has actually gone up. I think your question is: when will that actually reach its capacity?

Mr MINNIKIN: Correct.

Mr Scales: I would have to work that one out.

Mr MINNIKIN: I have two follow-ups to that, Mr Chair.

CHAIR: Okay.

Mr MINNIKIN: Again to the director-general, has any modelling been done on the traffic impacts from the additional Cross River Rail train services on level crossings, and what would be the cost to remove the impact on crossings?

Mr Scales: This refers back to Cross River Rail. I am a member of that board, but I ask for guidance because that is under the control of the Deputy Premier. To help the member, we have actually done some modelling on the removal of various level crossings and what the impact would be of the boom gates coming down. That depends on timings, it depends on the delivery of Cross River Rail itself as a project and it depends on—to the earlier question—patronage and capacity.

We have done some modelling. A report carried out in 2012 by Deloitte Access Economics looked at various level crossings and when they will be taken out. The member is correct in his line of questioning inasmuch as it depends on the capacity of the system and the patronage. These are very complicated matters and casting forward would depend on a number of variables.

Mr MINNIKIN: Mr Scales, what was the patronage modelling relied on to support the Cross River Rail business case, and how do those figures correspond to current usage?

Mr Scales: As far as the original public-facing document on Cross River Rail is concerned, it has been released as a public-facing document on that. To my recollection the numbers that we have now on the rail network are actually increasing. We are doing a lot of work now on a rail network strategy. That network strategy is a 10-year strategy that will not only look at Cross River Rail but the existing system we have and the existing constraints—the ones you have mentioned on level crossings, for example. That is currently being worked on now and will be released in due course. That will include all the infrastructure that we need for that.

CHAIR: Member for Traeger, do you have a quick question?

Mr KATTER: Minister, I refer to page 21 of the SDS and I ask: did the government's review of long-distance passenger services investigate the operation of the market, the fairness of pricing and

the service levels on unregulated and unsubsidised air routes in regional Queensland, particularly the north-west, which are experiencing extremely high pricing matched by declining service levels?

Mr BAILEY: I certainly acknowledge that, as someone with one of the largest electorates in the state, you have had an active interest in this space. This is an area that this government has certainly taken very seriously. We have restored the Local Fare Scheme that was cut by the previous LNP Newman government, which allowed subsidised travel by people in Cape York, and we have seen 4,000 people avail themselves of that. We supply seven regulated air routes across Queensland. Of course, the basis for that is a relatively small population across a very large distance. We remain very committed to those seven regulated routes.

I am also aware that there is a federal Senate inquiry at the moment looking at this very issue. We sent our officials to the hearings—and quite a few of them were in the honourable member's electorate—and we have made a submission in relation to that Senate inquiry. We see 161,000 trips on these regulated air routes every year, so they are well patronised. We look forward to seeing the outcome of that Senate inquiry.

003 That funding that we have extended both last term and this term includes \$8.3 million to extend the Local Fare Scheme in the current ports for a further two years and an additional \$2 million to expand the Local Fare Scheme as a 12-month trial to Doomadgee, Mornington Island and Weipa, of which two of those communities are in the honourable member's electorate. In June this year the government did that and that has been very welcomed by those communities. In terms of the future, we obviously want to see what the Senate inquiry may recommend, but our record of subsidising air travel has been very strong. In fact, the figure per year in terms of subsidies is over \$250 million, which includes all modes but certainly includes airfares as well. You can see that our commitment in that regard is very strong and I can assure you as the minister that it remains very strong.

Mr KATTER: Thank you, Minister. I appreciate the answer and I appreciate the government's efforts on the regulated routes, but that question specifically related to unregulated routes which would be like Mount Isa to Brisbane where it is unregulated and is probably the biggest problem area for us. I can repeat that question again if you want me to.

Mr BAILEY: I do not think that is necessary. Of course there are unregulated routes where the prices are delivered through competition and we are very supportive of the private sector doing so. That is not always something where everyone thinks the outcome is necessarily what they would prefer, but at this stage we have no plans to extend the regulated routes on to new routes. However, we are interested of course in seeing what the Senate inquiry comes down with in the next couple of months and we will continue to monitor the situation and engage with industry and with the community.

Mr KATTER: I think you have attempted to answer this question and today we just had announced levels of higher volumes of traffic through the Mount Isa Airport. Is the minister satisfied that the prices and service levels on those unregulated routes like Brisbane to Mount Isa are appropriate and meeting the expectations of the community and government?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. That is very much a matter for private operators. In that route is Qantas. I have certainly met with them and talked to them about regional prices. Of course we would like to see better outcomes and lower prices for people, but that is a matter for the private market and competition within that private market.

Mr KATTER: Based on the outcomes of the government's review of long-distance passenger services, has the government considered regulation of regional air services routes that are not currently subject to regulation including the Mount Isa to Townsville and Mount Isa to Brisbane route?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. It is a situation we continually monitor, but at this stage we are not examining new routes for additional subsidies that are not already allocated. We continue to monitor the situation and work with communities and listen to their feedback.

CHAIR: Thanks. Member, I think the minister did answer that one a couple of times. Did you have anything further?

Mr KATTER: I just have one final short one.

CHAIR: Okay, a quick one.

Mr KATTER: It is the last one on the airlines, Minister. Given the level of community satisfaction with the regional air routes and the barriers to market entry created by operators like Qantas, will the government commit to providing incentives and support to enable new carriers to enter these markets, given the clear evidence of market failure at the moment on that route?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. This is a matter for the private market. Obviously entry to markets is a matter for commercial operators to make judgements on and financial decisions about. There are a whole range of air providers in Queensland and also, for that matter, throughout Australia that could potentially enter this market. If there is a market failure there then there is probably a good potential for a new operator to do their homework and come in with a strong business case and start competing. In the end, it is a matter for the private market. There are considerable numbers of people moving between particularly Mount Isa and Townsville. There is a natural level of demand there, but it is in the end a matter for the private market.

CHAIR: Thank you, member. We will now go to the member for Aspley for a question.

Mr MELLISH: Thanks, Chair. My question is for the minister. I refer to page 15 of the SDS with regard to passenger transport services. Can the minister provide an update on fixing the trains?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question and acknowledge his interest in an efficient public transport network. The Fixing the Trains transformation program outlines an action plan for implementing the 36 Strachan inquiry recommendations and supporting the recovery of Queensland Rail to enable the return of a full service timetable. Each quarter the Citytrain Response Unit undertakes assurances to activities to ensure the intent of each recommendation is met. The quarterly reports, published on the Citytrain Response Unit website, outline key responses, recovery and transformation activities undertaken each quarter, results of key performance areas and the status of each recommendation.

I want to take this opportunity to advise the committee that the June quarterly report has been published and that, as at 30 June, 18 recommendations have been completed, three have been partially completed and 15 remain in progress. Key achievements over the past 12 months include the implementation of an eight-week train crew management plan supported by a refined forecasting model to enable the proactive management of timetable stress; development of communication tools and processes to ensure passengers receive advance notice of timetable changes and are kept informed during service disruptions—and a first stress period without taking a timetabled service downgrade occurred just recently in the July 2018 school holidays, a good sign of recovery and improvement on the system; the opening of train crew recruitment to external candidates with no prior Queensland Rail experience; and the reduction of driver training durations from 18 months to 13 months.

During the past 18 months Queensland Rail has been required to implement service changes during the school holiday period in order to assure service reliability while it continued efforts to increase train crew supply after the mess left to us by the previous LNP government. Under the previous LNP government and the assistant minister for public transport at the time, the member for Chatsworth, the LNP suspended driver recruitment, with more than 1,700 jobs cut from Queensland Rail including critical front-line roles like driver trainers. Most notably this quarter, thanks to a sustainable recovery program to stabilise the network, service delivery continued as normal through the June-July school holiday stress period for the first time since October 2016.

As I outlined in answer to a question on notice, the LNP's record on rail is much worse than I think most people realise. The Strachan commission of inquiry clearly found that the driver shortage was caused due to the LNP's failure to start the training for a single driver for the whole of 2014. In fact, the report said that had training not been suspended Queensland Rail would have had up to 30 more drivers in October 2016, when the Redcliffe peninsula line opened. Not only did they stop training drivers; they actually sacked the ones they already had. In 2014—

Mr MINNIKIN: Point of order, Mr Chair. I dispute the term 'sacked'. There were voluntary redundancies offered to trainers, but there were no forced sackings.

Mr BAILEY: That is not a point of order.

CHAIR: Okay. I will not take that point of order, but I will ask the minister not to be argumentative. I understand lessons in history, but could you please not be argumentative. I pulled up the member for Chatsworth earlier and I ask the same of you.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you for your guidance, Chair, but I think it is important we look at all of the factors that have contributed to the current situation. In 2014, the same year that the LNP cancelled driver training, they also got rid of 48 qualified train drivers, 32 of whom were responsible for training. This meant that the Palaszczuk government restarted driver training intakes in 2015 after we were elected and Queensland Rail was dealing with a skills deficit. They had lost a lot of experience, including 32 drivers who were responsible for running driver training. The other key impact on Queensland Rail's operations due to this cut-and-sack mentality of the former LNP government was a 25 per cent increase

in overtime costs for train drivers from the 2013-14 financial year to the 2014-15 financial year. This is because the same year that the LNP sacked drivers and cancelled driver training they also—

Mr MINNIKIN: We did not sack them, Minister. We offered them VERs.

CHAIR: Member, please do not interject and, Minister, please if you could not be argumentative.

Mr BAILEY: I could respond to that from the former assistant minister for public transport—

CHAIR: Yes, but we are not here to debate today.

Mr BAILEY: I will continue.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Mr BAILEY: They did that without any thought to the long-term impacts or a pipeline of drivers to sustain these services in the long term without an excessive reliance on overtime. Let us be very clear: the driver training was cut under the previous government. Some 48 fully qualified train drivers were gotten rid of and the former government relied heavily on overtime to support their timetable because there were fewer people to do the work. It is a simple piece of arithmetic.

It is the Palaszczuk Labor government that is fixing the trains and stabilising the services and, yes, we are using overtime to provide people with a sustainable service as happens throughout any rail system in the world, but we are getting that down as the media report in the *Brisbane Times* this morning showed. We are repairing this extensive damage done by the previous government through the implementation of the Strachan recommendations and we have seen the cost of overtime for drivers decrease by 4.3 per cent in the 2017-18 financial year. When compared with October 2016, overtime hours worked as a percentage of total worked time for guards is down six per cent.

In addition to all of this, we are still running more services now than the previous LNP government ever did. The Strachan inquiry recommended that Queensland Rail deliver and maintain a structural surplus of train crew to enable operations to be conducted without the systemic reliance on overtime. We are working hard to get more drivers and guards through their training and out into the network as quickly and as safely as possible. As you heard from the director-general of the department before, we have gotten down that 18 months training time under the previous government to 13 months. That means more drivers out more quickly.

Since 4 October 2016 Queensland Rail has selected 221 trainee drivers and 300 trainee guards, with 90 drivers and 216 guards now fully qualified and working on the South-East Queensland rail network as at 15 July 2018. I am very happy to report that a further 91 trainee drivers and 35 trainee guards are currently in training as of 15 July and this year alone more trainee drivers will commence training than did under the entire term of the previous LNP government. I am also happy to report that an additional 47 drivers are scheduled to commence their training, on top of those who are already in training by the end of 2018.

In net terms, we currently have 43 additional fully qualified drivers when compared to October 2016 due to factors such as natural attrition that occur of course every month. This includes 49 tutor drivers and 20 train operation inspectors who can be utilised as needed to drive passenger services. A particularly good example of that is the Commonwealth Games. The Strachan report also recommended that Queensland Rail would continue to operate with levels of overtime as do most rail operators. It is not unusual for operational workforces such as train crew to operate with some level of overtime given the wide variety of hours they need to work. It also of course allows flexibility to meet those demands.

Queensland Rail is working to minimise those overtime costs wherever possible while ensuring it maintains sustainable and reliable service levels in line with customer expectations. We have also seen a significant increase in reliability over the last 12 months, with Queensland Rail delivering more than 95 per cent of its services on time for four quarters in a row. We know that there is still a lot more that needs to be done. A gradual recovery as we have outlined is the only way forward and the only way possible. That is happening under this government and we are continuing to work with Queensland Rail on their recovery program.

CHAIR: Thank you very much, Minister, for that fulsome answer. The member for Bundamba has a question.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you very much, Chair, and I want to welcome viewers of Parliament.TV from my electorate who are now tuned in. Minister, Director-General or the head of Queensland Rail, as part of the Darra to Springfield transport corridor project stage 2, Queensland Rail entered into a services contract with Ipswich City Council and also a council controlled entity which is called Cherish

the Environment Foundation, and I table a copy of the annual report which is appropriate to that. Has Queensland Rail followed up to ensure that Ipswich City Council or the Cherish the Environment Foundation have actually done the work for which Queensland Rail has paid—that is, the delivery and the planting of more than 22,500 trees?

004

CHAIR: Is there a copy, because the question was to—

Mrs MILLER: I did not mind who answers it. We just want an answer to the question.

Mr BAILEY: I might ask the CEO of Queensland Rail.

CHAIR: Just wait until the others get a copy.

Mrs MILLER: There are plenty of copies.

CHAIR: Yes. We are just distributing them.

Mr Easy: I thank the honourable member for the question. I would like to take some time to follow up on that. Hopefully, I can give an answer before the end of the proceedings.

Mrs MILLER: That is fine. I have a follow-up question. When you are doing your research to answer this, can you find out for the people of Ipswich whether the money should have gone to the Cherish the Environment Foundation at all, because it is a charity; it is not a trust—it should have gone to a trust, not the charity—and also the location of where these trees may have been planted? If nothing has happened, would you please ask for the money to be returned?

CHAIR: There are a few questions there. I want to make sure that the CEO has those questions.

Mr Easy: Yes, I have those. We will endeavour to provide an answer.

CHAIR: Any more questions?

Mrs MILLER: On the same topic or a different topic?

CHAIR: Same topic—it is up to you.

Mrs MILLER: I have a different topic. This question is in relation to the dump trucks at Ipswich. Again, I do not mind whether the minister or the director-general answers this question. I have a series of photos, which I will table, that show the filth and dirt on the roads around Ipswich. I table those for the benefit of the committee.

CHAIR: Are they all the same?

Mrs MILLER: No, they are different photos. They are pretty damning photos of what people in my electorate have to put up with.

CHAIR: Could you continue with the question while we distribute those?

Mrs MILLER: Thank you. At the Ipswich Motorway intersection between Aberdare Street and River Road, when there is a shower or rain the whole road is covered in mud, which also may contain crushed building materials, including asbestos. It is very dangerous and Cleanaway, which is one of the dump operators, does not care at all about this. I would like to know whether the department can assure local residents that this particular intersection will be cleaned by Main Roads on a regular basis, because it is a hazard.

Mr BAILEY: I am just having a look at them now.

Mrs MILLER: You can see that it is shocking.

Mr BAILEY: Yes, I can certainly see it here. Indeed, that is not desirable at all, that is for sure. We are very happy to look into that. We would have to see whether it is a condition that they are not adhering to, or whether there is an absence of a condition. I am certainly happy to have my director-general look at it and come back to you. I certainly understand the impact. I am aware on other projects there are provisions where trucks can have their tyres cleaned before they go out on the road system. I am not—

Mrs MILLER: They ignore it, Minister. They ignore it.

Mr BAILEY: I am certainly happy to ask my director-general to look into it and come back to you. Certainly, after looking at those photographs I share your concern. Let us see what we can do about them.

Mrs MILLER: Just to follow up, can you ensure that Cleanaway and these road trucking companies will comply with the law, because the filth is being tracked through the suburbs of Dinmore,

New Chum and Riverview? It has a health and safety impact. Director-general, would you like to come back to my electorate once again?

Mr Scales: I am happy to accompany the local member around her patch, as I would any of the local members. The answer is yes.

Mr BAILEY: I am very happy for compliance to be looked at when the director-general has a look at it and inspects it. That is no problem.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Mr MELLISH: In relation to TransLink and Queensland Rail data, will the Minister please provide an update on any improvements that could be made to the publishing of data?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for question. The Palaszczuk government is absolutely committed to the publication of TransLink open data, Queensland Rail performance data and the quarterly *TransLink tracker*. We have listened to community feedback that this commitment to reporting and transparency could be improved through a public and regular publishing schedule.

I am pleased to advise the committee that the monthly performance and open data for both Queensland Rail and TransLink will now be published on or around the 10th day of each month. This practice will start from the publication of the June open data figures in August. We believe that the only way our services can improve is with the help of the people who use them every day. It is a relationship. This is in stark contrast, of course, to the former LNP government, which cancelled the publication of the *TransLink tracker* and ushered in a culture of secrecy when it came to the performance of the public transport network between 2012-2014. The *Translink tracker* is a quarterly snapshot of the performance of the South-East Queensland public transport network. I seek leave to table the *TransLink tracker* for the third quarter of 2017-18. We have copies for the committee.

CHAIR: We need to see that before we accept that. Continue talking.

Mr BAILEY: Yes, that is fine.

CHAIR: It is a public document, yes. Is leave granted? Leave is granted.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you. I can advise the committee that the third quarter Tracker shows a very encouraging 5.5 per cent increase in public transport patronage across the network when compared to the same period last year. In real terms, that represents around 2.4 million more public transport trips across the network from January to March of this year compared to the same period last year. Patronage was also up across all modes compared to the previous quarter from October to December 2017.

On-time running for bus and train services exceeded TransLink's benchmarks. Bus on-time running was at 94.67 per cent for the third quarter. Peak on-time running for trains was 95.02 per cent above target for the quarter. This is a terrific outcome that demonstrates the impact that the Palaszczuk Labor government's significant investment and hard work in improving our public transport networks is delivering and improving.

We look forward to continuing to provide public transport data that is accurate, current and regular so that we and the people of Queensland know where we stand on our performance—unlike the former LNP government, which preferred to bury its poor performance and hide its failures by denying that data to the Queensland public.

CHAIR: I have a question about rail. I noticed in your opening statement that you mentioned a few station upgrades. Could you provide a quick update on the station upgrade program and explain how it will benefit commuters in South-East Queensland? I am particularly excited about Dakabin station.

Mr BAILEY: I knew you would be, Mr Chairperson. You have been a very strong advocate on behalf of the commuters at Dakabin from the very beginning 3½ years ago. I acknowledge your very hard work in that regard and your commitment.

The Palaszczuk Labor government was committed to providing accessible, safe and reliable public transport for all Queenslanders. We are delivering this through our station upgrade program—a fund that is helping us improve accessibility of stations to meet the needs of the diverse range of people who use our network and who want to use our network. As South-East Queensland's population continues to grow, we are focused on improving the accessibility of Queensland Rail stations to ensure that all customers have access to the rail services that connect their communities with employment and services and family and friends.

We are proud to be injecting a further \$80 million to ensure the continued delivery of Queensland Rail's station accessibility upgrade program in a major win not only for customers but also for the local construction industry. This extra funding boosts the Palaszczuk government's investment in the program to \$300 million—an investment that will support 3½ thousand construction industry jobs in total.

Through this ongoing program, we have completed accessibility upgrades at Graceville, which is now in my new electorate, but was not in my previous term. I can say that the feedback from locals has been extraordinarily positive. We have also completed accessibility upgrades at the Dinmore, Nambour, Alderley and Newmarket stations. Works have begun at the Morayfield, Boondall and Strathpine stations. We will also be delivering a station upgrade at the Dakabin station.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Mr BAILEY: I certainly acknowledge your strong advocacy there. Another station upgrade I am very pleased to announce is to the Albion station. Despite representing the electorate of Clayfield since 2006, including time as a shareholding minister for Queensland Rail, the current member for Clayfield failed to deliver a single station upgrade in his electorate, despite having, I think, seven or eight stations in that part of the city. But do not worry, Clayfield, the Palaszczuk Labor government is looking out for your transport needs.

In addition to Dakabin and Albion, planning and design work is underway for the next round of high-priority stations at Auchenflower, Buranda, Loganlea, Cannon Hill, East Ipswich and Fairfield. Artist impressions have now been released for these stations and shared on Queensland Rail's website and with Queensland Rail customers for their feedback, including on-site, on-platform presentations with staff. I have been at one at the Fairfield station. There was a lot of interest from commuters. It is very convenient for them to have a look at it as they are waiting for their train in the mornings in particular.

Improvements to the stations can include new footbridges and lifts, entry-level platforms in boarding zones, accessible toilets, extending waiting shelters and accessibility features such as hearing-aid loops, tactile layouts and lower ticket counters to help those people who have some disabilities. Our government's investment will mean that customers at these locations can travel safely and easily without barriers, including people who use mobility aids, seniors and those with luggage or prams. Other improvements that will be explored throughout this design process include upgraded lighting and closed-circuit television and station refresh works.

Queensland Rail will continue to work closely with the accessibility reference group to ensure that the scope of these station upgrades reflects customers' needs and provide a single path of access. I would like to sincerely thank all of those people who contribute to the accessibility reference group—from all kinds of groups representing different disabilities. Their information and contributions are invaluable. The upgrade of these additional stations will increase the number of independently accessible stations on the city network from 80 to 91, which will mean that about 83 per cent of Queensland Rail's customers will travel to and from accessible stations once this current tranche of upgrades are complete.

CHAIR: Thanks, Minister. That is good news for the disability sector. Member for Chatsworth?

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is to the minister. Can you explain the impact that three successive years of 15 per cent increases in public transport fares, approved by then transport minister Anastacia Palaszczuk, have had on public transport patronage since that time?

CHAIR: You are going back a fair way there.

Mr BAILEY: Can I seek clarification? This is about the budget allocations for 2018-19.

CHAIR: That is right.

Mr BAILEY: That is going back about three governments, I believe. It seems to be an odd question that is not relevant.

Mr SORENSEN: You have been going back all morning.

Mr MINNIKIN: Correct.

CHAIR: Yes, but there is a limit as to how far back we can go. Minister, is there any answer that you could provide to that question, or will we seek another line of questioning?

Mr BAILEY: All I would say is that this government initially froze the fares and then we brought in Fairer Fares, which has seen huge gains for commuters.

Mr MINNIKIN: Huge?

CHAIR: Please do not interrupt.

Mr BAILEY: I would suggest to the former assistant minister for public transport under Campbell Newman that any fare reduction that gives 93 per cent of commuters a benefit is a very strong, positive thing. That is something that we did not see under the previous government. Given that he has referenced previous governments, I think it is only fair that I should get one reference in. We saw 7½ per increases under the previous LNP government.

Mr MINNIKIN: Point of order.

CHAIR: I will hear the point of order. I do not think there is a point of order. Referring to a history is fine, but it just depends how far back we go. We are here today to talk about the Appropriation Bill this year and how it is affected by previous years. We are going back quite a way. Minister, thank you. I believe that you have answered—

005 **Mr BAILEY:** But I certainly can add some current information in terms of the budget in terms of this question.

CHAIR: I will just hear this point of order.

Mr MINNIKIN: If the minister wants to answer the question, that is fine, otherwise we will proceed. I just wanted your clarification and consistent ruling, and I appreciate and thank you for it, in relation to how far back we want to go into ancient history.

CHAIR: Minister, we will go to the next question.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you, Mr Chair. Thank you for your guidance. My question is to the minister. In terms of delivering innovative ticketing products, can the minister please advise what happened to the formation of the public advisory panel which was a recommendation of the government's 2016 fare review?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. Recently I announced a very significant new ticketing contract with Cubic that is a \$380 million commitment to the latest technology and the best ticketing system that is currently in London, Vancouver and Chicago. There is an \$89 million allocation in this year's 2018-19 budget to do that. We are getting cracking in terms of that. We are the first state in the whole country to do so.

This will allow us to have a ticket system for the entire state for the first time—the same ticketing system. Eighteen regional areas, as well as Brisbane and South-East Queensland, will have the same ticketing system with bank grade security so you can use your smart watch or your smart phone, your debit card or your credit card—whatever is convenient for you. What we have seen where this system has been rolled out across other cities has been very strong increases in public transport patronage because it is so easy to use and it increases the efficiency of the system which increases the speed of travel. We have seen very strong gains in London, Vancouver and also Chicago.

It is also very good for tourists, because it is an easy system to use. You can simply log on before you arrive at your place of destination. It makes the public transport system very easily negotiable so there are great tourism benefits as well as benefits for commuters not just in South-East Queensland but also across the whole of the state. I think that is a very significant thing to note, because people in Townsville, in Cairns and in regional cities like Rockhampton want the same level of customer service as people in South-East Queensland receive. This new ticketing system that the Palaszczuk government has awarded to Cubic and that will be rolled out will do exactly that.

This builds on the record of Labor. Of course, we brought in the go card. We were the first state to bring in the go card more than 10 years ago. This will create about 65 new jobs in technical fields, including IT and engineering, adding to Cubic's 120 staff that are already here. The project will install equipment on nearly 3,000 buses and ferries, 154 rail stations, 19 tram stations, 34 busway stations and 26 ferry terminals. It is going to be a very big project. We have substantial allocations already in this budget, despite the fact that we have only allocated the contract recently. It is good to see Queensland looking at the latest technology that is to the benefit of public transport commuters. We want to see those patronage levels up.

We have already seen very positive figures in the last quarter, with a 5.5 per cent increase. We want to see that every quarter. We want to see more people using public transport, which benefits everybody on our transport system, not just people on public transport. Everyone who uses the road system, for instance, benefits when there is modal shift on public transport because the road system gets used more effectively as well. We are proud of the new ticketing system and I certainly give the

committee and Queenslanders the commitment that we will keep you updated with the rollout. In relation to the question asked by the member for Chatsworth, the panel is due to be appointed shortly.

Mr MINNIKIN: 'Shortly' could mean what? 'Shortly' as in when, given that this was recommended back in 2016? We are now halfway through 2018. Could you be a bit more precise in relation to firming up exactly a time frame?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. 'Shortly' means in the near future.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you. According to Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, 20.2 per cent of people in Brisbane travelled to work by public transport back in 2011. This fell to 18.6 per cent in 2016. Minister, can you please explain why under Labor more people are abandoning public transport, thereby adding to the heavy road congestion already choking our network?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. I note that the majority of the time frame he included referred to the Newman LNP government, so that seems to be a bit of an own goal from the former assistant minister for transport.

Mr MINNIKIN: Not really. 2011-2016? I don't think so.

CHAIR: Please do not interject. The minister is answering the question.

Mr MINNIKIN: Erroneously.

CHAIR: I ask you to withdraw that.

Mr MINNIKIN: I withdraw.

CHAIR: Minister?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. The time frame mentioned in the question is 2011 to 2016. It is a fact that the Newman government was in office from 2012 to 2015 and the honourable member served as the assistant minister for public transport during that time. The key thing here is that we have seen an improvement in the public transport data of over five per cent tabled today.

To get public transport patronage up you have to do a whole range of things. You have to have the best ticketing system, which we have already acted on with a substantial commitment. You have to build public transport infrastructure. I have to say to the honourable member: if you believe in public transport you believe in Cross River Rail. It is a no-brainer. It should have been done by the previous government and was not. Despite the fact that we have had Canberra blocking us and not contributing to Cross River Rail, it is critical. Every rail line throughout South-East Queensland will benefit from doubling the inner-city rail capacity, which means time benefits for every rail line right throughout the system.

Of course, we have a very strong commitment already to adding to our public transport infrastructure. We duplicated the heavy line from Helensvale to Coomera, which was the last single-line section to the Gold Coast. That allowed us to get eight trains per hour into the Gold Coast for the very first time in history on opening ceremony night. It would not have been possible unless we had decided early in the first term to build that. There were no plans to fund that by the previous LNP government. It was a \$163 million commitment. We did that in two years, in time for the Commonwealth Games. It was a critical part of the transport plan that we delivered.

Of course, we also built Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2—and I pay tribute to the current Deputy Premier and Treasurer. She understood then, as the minister for transport, that unless we built light rail stage 2 in record time the transport plan for the Commonwealth Games was imperilled. We did exactly that in 18 months. I think if you look at what is happening in New South Wales with their light rail system, which is 12 months late and \$1 billion over budget, and compare it to the \$420 million project that the Palaszczuk government delivered in 18 months flat, allowing us to move 1.8 million people across the light rail system during the Commonwealth Games, you can see that our performance far exceeds New South Wales.

Of course, the benefit is that people get to use that infrastructure every single day after the games. We are seeing a 33 per cent increase in public transport patronage on the light rail system on the Gold Coast. That is why we are doing the business case for stage 3A. The rail system now is fully duplicated all the way to Varsity Lakes. With Cross River Rail coming in, this will add new stations to the network. Importantly, the CBD will have better coverage so we will see the Albert Street station come in—at the moment that is quite remote from the rail system that skirts the CBD on the northern side—giving a lot of coverage to the new Queen's Wharf development and QUT Gardens Point. A lot of public servants who live down in that sector will be able to easily get on the train and go directly south

and north, integrating with Roma Street, integrating with the new station at the Gabba—we will have a heavy rail station at one of our major sporting venues at the Gabba and that will be phenomenally well used and assist in terms of the sporting events that occur there—and then integrating with the southern line, with the Park Road station as well and north into the line that goes through the exhibition urban renewable area.

If you want to support public transport patronage you have to support the infrastructure needed to make it a better service. The Palaszczuk government has a very strong record, whether it is the duplication of the heavy rail line on the coast, Helensvale to Coomera, light rail stage 2 or Cross River Rail—fully funded by us. We are getting on with it.

I might add that in this budget there is more than \$700 million for Cross River Rail. That is a project that the LNP has opposed all the way. You cannot have any credibility about public transport patronage if you oppose Cross River Rail. Cross River Rail should have happened by now. It should be two-thirds built. It was not, because the previous government dumped it. We are getting on with that job. It is critical to public transport patronage. We will see a modal shift onto rail, particularly going from Brisbane to the Gold Coast, of about 18½ thousand people. That will also mean the M1 will be in better shape because for some people—not all people, but for some people—it will be faster to get to Brisbane and commute on the rail line with Cross River Rail and our improvements to the rail system than it would be to drive. Our record is very strong. We are seeing the benefits of that in the tracker today and I look forward to more benefits into the future.

Mr MINNIKIN: My next question is again to the minister. I refer to page 15 of the Service Delivery Statements with regard to passenger transport services, noting the ministerial responsibility to improve the efficiency and the effectiveness of public transport in South-East Queensland through the renewed bus contracts. Minister, can you explain why only four of the 13 bus service contracts had been awarded after four years in government whilst the remainder were still on emergency contracts until very recently?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. We are very committed to the public transport system, including the bus network. I am afraid the honourable member seems to have his facts wrong there because, in fact, there have been 15 of them awarded, not four.

Mr MINNIKIN: Until very recently.

Mr BAILEY: You seem to be nearly 400 per cent out there. The New Generation Contracts program is still underway and continues to renew all expiring bus contracts. Fourteen of the 16 South-East Queensland contracts have already been finalised. Work is also underway to renew the regional bus contracts. The department has been consulting across industry and expects to finalise the majority of these contracts in November 2018. Brisbane City Council have signed a one-year extension of the existing contract for bus services in Brisbane. Both the state and the council have almost finalised negotiations of the terms of a three-plus-one-year contract. Just to clarify, Mr Chair, no emergency contracts have been used.

Mr MINNIKIN: Mr Scales, with the bus contracts, what was the cost to the state of Queensland of external consultants used during this process?

Mr Scales: I thank the honourable member for the question. Obviously these are complicated matters and we needed certainly external legal advice. We needed external advice as well in other matters. I am just waiting for somebody to hand me a brief that will tell me exactly what the costs are. If we do not have those costs we can certainly get them for you. Certainly we would have used specialist legal advice on this and specialist other advice as well just to make sure everything worked.

Mr MINNIKIN: I am conscious of the committee's time, but if it is a matter of 30 seconds or so.

CHAIR: Can you get that for us later?

Mr Scales: Yes. I do not have all those figures in one place. With the chair's indulgence, returning to the Merivale Street Bridge capacity issue, I have had it confirmed that it is now under the control of the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority. They have all the current modelling actually in their purview now. I was struggling with it before, but it will be an input into the 10-year rail strategy but it is a matter for them.

Mr MINNIKIN: My next question is to the minister. I know that he has had an attempt at having a crack at this this morning. Minister, why is TransLink months behind with basic performance reporting? The last TransLink Tracker quarterly report, which was for Q1 and Q2 in 2017-18, had to be combined because it was so late and for Q3 in 2017-18 it has yet to surface, despite it now being

2018-19. There is an habitual pattern here of this information being months behind. Can you please explain to the committee why?

006 Mr BAILEY: Of course, I answered most of this question previously during the session, but I can certainly add to that. The Palaszczuk government is committed to the publication of open data and the quarterly TransLink Tracker. They are publicly available right now, which is in stark contrast to when the shadow minister for public transport, the member for Chatsworth, was part of the LNP Newman government and they were not available whatsoever. Our record, even before the announcement this morning, was so much stronger on involving the public with that data, which is a snapshot of the South-East Queensland public transport network performance.

I can advise that from this morning we have made some adjustments to the regularity of it. I know that there was some feedback from people who wanted to see it on a much more regular basis. I outlined to the committee not long ago that basically the open data figures for Queensland Rail and TransLink will now be published on or around the 10th day of each month, starting with the publication of the June open data figures next month. The government remains committed to openness and transparency when it comes to the performance of our public transport network, unlike the previous LNP government, which preferred to bury that poor performance and hide those failures.

I outlined this only about 20 minutes ago. I am happy to outline it for a second time for those members of the committee who might not have been listening when I did so.

CHAIR: I note that the member for Maiwar has joined us. I welcome the member for Maiwar and ask if he has a question to ask while he is here?

Mr BERKMAN: Thank you, Chair. My first question is for the minister. Minister, has the department conducted or commissioned any feasibility study into rail infrastructure connecting to the Galilee Basin and what are the findings of any such study?

Mr BAILEY: The Palaszczuk Labor government made a very clear commitment that that project has to stand on its own two feet in terms of its commerciality. That has been our very clear view and it remains our view to this day. We get various inquiries on all sorts of roads at all sorts of times which we respond to. I can say that we have kept our election commitment in that regard. We have been very clear and consistent that that project must stand on its own two feet. There are provisions under the conditions that any responsibility for road upgrades is a matter for the project itself. We have been very consistent on this and very clear. I think there was some media interest on this only a month or two ago. I reiterated that position and I am very happy to reiterate that position here today.

Mr BERKMAN: My question was specifically in relation to the existence of any feasibility study into rail infrastructure that may have been conducted or commissioned by the department. The minister's answer seems to have gone to questions around road infrastructure that have come up recently and the government's broad position on the viability of the project.

CHAIR: Did you have a question, member?

Mr BERKMAN: The question is, again, are there any feasibility studies into rail infrastructure in the Galilee that are held by the department, whether they have been commissioned by or conducted by the department?

Mr BAILEY: I might ask my director-general, as the head of the department, to comment on that.

Mr Scales: I am not aware of any, because it is a matter for the mining companies to do that. I cannot think of anything we have done in that area on rail feasibility at all.

Mr BERKMAN: Thank you for the answer.

CHAIR: Minister, with regards to QTRIP, will you please update the committee on the record spend in this year's budget, including for my favourite project, the Petrie roundabout upgrade?

Mr BAILEY: I acknowledge the member's passionate advocacy for the Petrie roundabout upgrade, which I was very pleased to announce recently. It will be very important in terms of the university development. He should be very proud that he has achieved that.

The recently released Queensland Transport and Roads Investment Program delivers a record investment of \$21.7 billion in Queensland's transport and roads infrastructure over the next four years. This year's QTRIP marks three consecutive years that the Palaszczuk Labor government has delivered a record investment in road and transport infrastructure for Queensland, with total funding higher than the previous QTRIP by more than \$700 million in this budget. Disappointingly, compared to last year's budget, funding from the federal LNP government has seen a cut from \$8.1 billion to \$7.6 billion, which is a 6.2 per cent cut. However, this has been offset by a 10 per cent increase in funding from the

Palaszczuk Labor government. In fact, the \$700 million increase in QTRIP funding for 2018-19 is 100 per cent due to our government's increased investment. This record investment will significantly improve the state's transport network and increase employment opportunities for Queenslanders.

The government is committed to connecting our regions, fostering economic growth and creating jobs, with this year's QTRIP estimated to support an average of approximately 19,200 direct jobs over the life of the four-year program. The Palaszczuk Labor government is committed to the preservation and maintenance of our transport network to effectively support the movement of people, freight and services across our state. This significant investment in Queensland's road network will better connect our communities, enhance road safety and generate local jobs.

Major road projects in construction or due to start this year include the \$812 million widening of the Bruce Highway between Caloundra Road and Sunshine Motorway. Anyone who has driven through there recently could not miss that mammoth site. They are going very well, despite having received a fair bit of rain. There is the \$514 million Haughton River floodplain upgrade on the Bruce Highway and the \$479 billion Mackay Ring Road project. We have allocated \$115 million to that project this financial year. That project is going very strongly. I was happy to visit that site about two months ago. There is the Rocklea to Darra Ipswich Motorway upgrade, which I am very happy about. I know that the member for Bundamba is very pleased to see that happen as well. There is the \$152 million Smithfield bypass upgrade and the \$121 million Rockhampton northern access upgrade as well. Of course, there are many more projects on top of that, but they are certainly the headliners. Queensland Rail's infrastructure will benefit from enhancements across the rail network, including station accessibility upgrades and parking facilities.

Unlike the LNP, we know that bike-riding infrastructure is not gold plating. We will continue to promote active transport, because we know that every person who rides means less traffic and congestion, a healthier community and less pollution. It makes good sense that when you do major road upgrades you do them as well, given the economies of scale make it so much cheaper to build at that point. We want to see more people cycling and riding bikes more often, and we have the Queensland Cycling Strategy to help us achieve that. We are working to that goal through our investment of \$67.5 million in this budget and \$240 million over the next four years. We have included cycling infrastructure in projects such as the Ipswich Motorway upgrade and the Gateway Arterial North, which you can see very clearly as you drive through there. These are major gains to our network. It is effectively retrofitting a cycleway as we do major road infrastructure, which makes a lot of sense. Of course, it returns about \$5 in economic benefits to Queenslanders for every dollar of investment in bikeway infrastructure that we put in.

Projects such as the Veloway 1, from the Brisbane CBD to Eight Mile Plains, and the North Brisbane Bikeway, between Bowen Hills and Wooloowin, are providing Queenslanders with genuine alternatives to getting around by car and they are very popular. We are continuing our support for local governments to build better bike paths in communities right across the state. Recently I visited Thursday Island for the first time and saw firsthand the difference a bike path can make for local communities—not just for the riders who use them but also for the jobs they create for local people during construction. It is a real win for everybody. It is also terrific for tourists as you can tour around a fair bit of the island by bike. There is probably not a better view from a cycleway anywhere.

The budget also sees investment in the future of the Queensland economy through the development of cycle tourism on rail trails across the state. I have been very happy to develop and see committed in this budget \$14 million over the next four years for our rail trail program to convert disused and redundant state owned rail corridors into trails for riding, walking and horseriding. Rail trails not only make great use of publicly owned land for local residents; they also encourage cycle tourism, which generates tremendous economic activity in regional communities. As the Minister for Transport, it is my belief that, given the kind of state that we have and the extraordinary landscapes and environment that we have, this is a major area that we can benefit from and gain on. We should not let New Zealand get away with that; we think Queensland can compete in that space. This is going to be a contribution to it.

The government will continue to invest in marine investment with the construction and upgrading of boating infrastructure right across Queensland. An additional \$30 million boost for boaties was committed to during our election campaign. Access to jobs, education and services for our ever-growing communities will also benefit from funding commitments towards bus infrastructure. This year's record QTRIP confirms the Palaszczuk government's dedication to delivering efficient, safe, sustainable and reliable transport infrastructure and services across our state.

When it comes to the member's specific question, I am happy to inform him that in 2018-19 we will be spending over \$10 million, which includes a \$1.4 million budget for 2018-19 and a total \$30 million project cost for the Anzac Avenue-Gympie Road-Dayboro Road intersection, otherwise known as the Petrie roundabout. As it ramps up, we will see more expenditure to deliver that fantastic project for the north side. Congratulations to the member for his successful lobbying for that project.

Mrs MILLER: I table more photographs. Those photographs are of rubbish trailers parked along Monash Road and other roads within the Motorway Industrial Estate at Redbank. It is understood that those trucks are en route to the dreadful BMI dump at Swanbank. My question is to the director-general. Director-General, can you please provide the appropriate budget and the officers to investigate this practice of separating the rigs from the trailers and leaving the rubbish trailers in our community, particularly at Redbank? Can you also provide the inspectors to bring the full force of the law down on those trucking companies? Those trucks hurtle through our suburbs. They hurtle through Redbank and Goodna, in particular. They drop the rigs off and they leave those dreadful-smelling trailers in our community.

Mr Scales: For the benefit of the committee, it is probably worthwhile saying that between August 2017 and March 2018 Transport and Main Roads, in concert with QPS and the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, did some intercepts of those vehicles on the Pacific Highway and at Yamanto on the Cunningham Highway. We were able to look at fatigue, which is the logbook, mass and dimension checks, vehicle standard safety, loading and also registration details. We actually intercepted 553 vehicles. We issued 92 defect notices and 43 penalty infringements. As the member says, they are en route to New Chum and also Swanbank. The dump trucks have general access rights to the two sites. They are able to access the site. As far as what they are doing there, the member has just provided some really useful photographs. I think this is probably a really good thing to look at on a site visit. In the meantime, I can also make sure that we work through these specific issues. I will deploy some inspectors as well. Could I get the location of that separately?

CHAIR: We can take that off line.

Mrs MILLER: I am happy to. It is Monash Road at Redbank in the industrial estate. Thank you for your deployment of inspectors to try to sort it out.

Mr Scales: I think that is a local government road, so that is probably one of the reasons that I am not familiar with it. We will certainly check it out.

007 **Mrs MILLER:** In relation to development applications with Ipswich City Council, particularly in relation to superdump areas, I am just wondering whether there has been a special deal done by Main Roads to allow BMI to use the Cunningham Highway or Redbank Plains Road for the transport of dump and/or landfill materials? The reason I ask this is that a similar application to that of BMI's was refused to Colmine Consulting for moving clean soil to a landfill holding yard. I am not cast any aspersions in relation to you or your officers. Can you please set aside the resources to review the department of main roads' development approvals, bearing in mind the allegations of alleged corruption, alleged misconduct and alleged maladministration of Ipswich City Council and its officers?

CHAIR: There are a few questions there.

Mr Scales: On the development application side of things, we work in concert with our colleagues in SARA. It is not necessarily always in the department's gift to actually grant these things. I am not aware of any specific deals that have or have not been down that the member is referring to. A lot of the areas are under the control of the Ipswich City Council and we would not necessarily have a locus there. What I can do, through my minister, is take this offline as one of the issues that I will take up locally with the local member and work through.

Mrs MILLER: That is fine. We will have quite a number of these development approvals for you to review.

Mr Scales: They may not be our locations at all. They may be Ipswich City Council's or somebody else's. They may not be on state land; that is all I am saying.

Mrs MILLER: No, but this is where the Ipswich City Council has the department of main roads as an agency as well and where they have referred it across to you. That is what I am concerned about.

Mr Scales: It would go to SARA as well. We would be a contingent agency, really. We can work the details through separately.

CHAIR: Are you happy with that?

Mrs MILLER: Yes, I am. I have a follow-up question in relation to rail. I do not mind if the head of QR comes to the table for this question. On behalf of the constituents in my area, I would like to know why the government has not proceeded with the extension of the railway line through to Redbank Plains. My constituents want to know how many officers are currently working on this project, if any? Is there any budget attached to the extension of the railway line to Redbank Plains? What is the status, if any?

CHAIR: There are quite a few questions there.

Mr Scales: For the Redbank Plains extension, along with any other transport extension, whether it be rail, road or tram, obviously the planning needs to be done first. This particular issue will be added to the 10-year rail strategy, which I referred to in a previous answer to a question from the member for Chatsworth. I do not think there is anybody specifically working on that particular line, but we are looking at a 10-year rail strategy for the whole of the state. It will be in there. What the timing is, I do not know. It will have to compete for resources in the normal way. It will be subject to normal procedures. There are no plans at the moment to extend it, but it will be part of the 10-year rail strategy.

Mr MELLISH: I refer to page 4 of the SDS and note the tabled answer to the question on notice. Can the minister provide an update on the progress of a business case for Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 3A, specifically relating to plans for community consultation?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the member for his ongoing interest and commitment to public transport. Light rail is certainly one of Labor's proudest public transport legacies in Queensland. It has been built and funded by Labor governments. Light Rail Stage 2 was delivered by the Palaszczuk Labor government under budget and in record time for the Commonwealth Games.

During what was the largest international sporting event our state has ever seen, much of the public transport heavy lifting was done by our light rail network. For 11 days G:Link powered on, operating 24 hours a day during the games, with tram services running every six minutes during peak event periods. I had personal experience of it at the time. I rode the system regularly. I saw how our coordination centre would deliberately manipulate additional services in at egress times as crowds came out of events. To see it move 300 people every couple of minutes where needed was absolutely fantastic to watch and experience.

More than 1.1 million passengers were moved via the light rail network. That equates to an average of more than 100,000 passengers a day and more than three times the daily average since the opening of stage 2 in December 2017. This was also part of our hugely successful integrated transport plan that also saw a major uplift in services across the whole Gold Coast public transport network.

The 7.3-kilometre Light Rail Stage 2 connected stage 1 at the Gold Coast University Hospital with Helensvale via Parkwood and Parkwood East. Thanks to light rail, commuters can now take a seamless rail journey from Brisbane to Broadbeach via Helensvale station where it is a very quick transfer—one I have done now many times, particularly during the Commonwealth Games.

Public transport trips have increased by more than 32 per cent since light rail commenced in 2014. Since stage 2 opened, light rail patronage has surged by 33 per cent. Light rail has been a transformational project for the Gold Coast. This morning I announced that community consultation for light rail extension 3A will happen throughout August. Community members will be able to speak with project team members, view reference design maps, get a better understanding of the proposed extension and give their feedback on the project and reference design. This will happen at the information stalls and the drop-in sessions and via an online survey at GCLR3A.com.au.

Off the back of this success, the Palaszczuk Labor government is partnering with the City of Gold Coast to produce a detailed business case for stage 3A of the Gold Coast Light Rail network. The proposed new 6.7-kilometre stage 3A alignment extends the network south to Burleigh Heads from Broadbeach South light rail station with a dual track in the centre of the Gold Coast Highway. Comprising seven or eight new stations and adding five new trams to the existing 18-vehicle fleet, stage 3A is anticipated to have a journey time of around 16 to 17 minutes.

Community drop-in sessions will be held in Burleigh Heads and Mermaid Beach in mid-August—the sessions will be advertised in local newspapers—and approximately 21,000 newsletters will be delivered to letterboxes along and adjacent to the stage 3A alignment. It is important for the community to have an opportunity to comment on the reference design and gain an understanding of the proposed extension. Valuable community feedback provided during the drop-in sessions will be used to inform the detailed design. I understand the detailed business case will be finalised late this year. It will inform

the government about the proposed route, procurement and financial implications, with costs and benefits included.

Construction of Light Rail Stage 3A would take around two to three years and would be contingent on funding being secured from all three levels of government. I acknowledge that that has occurred for the first two stages. Just as light rail stages 1 and 2 have been transformative for the Gold Coast, stage 3A will help prepare the Gold Coast for an expected 62 per cent population boost to over 928,000 by 2041. It will be looking a little different to my first six years which I spent on the Gold Coast, having been born there. It has changed a little bit since then.

More than 12 million people currently visit the Gold Coast annually. This figure is going to grow into the future. Stage 3A will build on the public transport revolution that light rail has delivered to the Gold Coast while preserving the region's attractiveness and liveability and help keep the coast moving for decades to come. When it comes to public transport infrastructure construction, it is only Labor that does it in this state.

CHAIR: We will now move to non-government questions.

Mr MINNIKIN: Minister, does your office supply any influence or pressure over the publishing of the Queensland Rail monthly performance data?

CHAIR: Is that really tied to the expenditure, member?

Mr MINNIKIN: It is in relation to the Service Delivery Statements, passenger transport and the publication of data.

Mr BAILEY: As I have twice outlined to the committee, I have announced today the fact that there will be a regular date for those to be published together so there is predictability about when they come out. We re-established this transparent data reporting for the public after it was stopped by the previous government, of which the honourable member was the assistant minister for public transport. I do look forward to him apologising for taking access to that data away from the public for three years. We have restored that so people can see the performance data. We are seeing the regularity of that finetuned. Of course I work with my agencies. I like to see improvements occur. In our office we only get a noting brief from the agency. It does not get approval from us. That is how it falls.

Mr MINNIKIN: That information is conveyed to you via email?

Mr BAILEY: My office interacts with the agencies in all the normal ways.

Mr MINNIKIN: Is the reluctance to tackle the Brisbane City Council bus service contract another example of the Labor government ignoring commuters and siding with the powerful union which does not want its comfortable work arrangements scrutinised? This is in relation to passenger services—

CHAIR: I will pull you up there. There is quite an inference there. I understand that there has been a bit of back and forward, but could you rephrase that, if you can?

Mr MINNIKIN: In relation to the Brisbane City Council bus service contract, how much influence do any external stakeholders have in relation to that process?

CHAIR: Well done.

Mr BAILEY: I think I have outlined previously that we signed the Brisbane City Council extension to their existing contract recently. We have almost finalised negotiations of the terms for a three-plus-one-year contract. We look for the best possible outcome for commuters. We do believe in supporting our workforce. We do listen to our workforce. We do not sack them; we listen to them. We see it as a partnership.

I will be very clear that our remit is to work with all stakeholders to ensure the best possible outcomes for commuters. That has always been our approach. What we are seeing is the benefit of that. There has been a 5½ per cent increase in public transport patronage in the last quarter, on the back of a better relationship with the workforce, investing in infrastructure, investing in new ticketing systems. Today's announcement is another enhancement in terms of making sure that data is available for people regularly.

I am a very passionate public transport supporter. I have used it all my life. It is something that has interested me as a policy area all my life. I want to see continued improvements for public transport users, whether that be ferry, bus or train. That has very much been my approach. I am happy to provide that information a second time. I think it was probably about 20 or 30 minutes ago that I provided it the first time.

Mr MINNIKIN: I refer to pages 4 and 5 of the Service Delivery Statements and performance in relation to QTRIP. Can you provide an update on how far the road maintenance investment for the four-year rolling program will stretch and how many kilometres of road already identified as in need of repair today will be still left in need of repair at the end of this period?

Mr BAILEY: We have a very extensive road network across Queensland. There are over 180,000 kilometres of roads, of which about 33,000 kilometres are state controlled roads. The maintenance of those roads is very important. This year there has been an increase in the maintenance budget for our road network. I can certainly inform the committee of a number of things here. We are certainly committed to a quality road network. To address the high-priority needs and maintain the safety of the state's network we have well-developed asset management processes.

008 My department's 'run, maintain, build' philosophy supports the prioritisation of investment in maintenance, preservation and operation to get as much as possible out of the existing network. The current Queensland Transport and Roads Investment Program provides \$4.1 billion for maintenance, preservation and operation of the state controlled road network over the next four years. It is certainly one of the largest systems in the nation, taking into account an injection of an extra \$100 million in this year's budget into maintenance, preservation and operation activities. This reflects an increase of \$340 million, or nine per cent, over the previous QTRIP in last year's budget, where the figure was \$3.75 billion.

Within available funds, maintenance and preservation of Queensland's state controlled road network is managed through a structured program aimed at delivering agreed levels of service at minimum life cycle cost. My department's current asset sustainability ratio—the extent to which my department is funding the deterioration of the network—is 52 per cent. Over recent years the asset sustainability ratio has improved, recognising the importance of maintaining the state's largely physically built asset which recorded a gross replacement value of \$75.691 billion as at 30 June last year. My department continues to increase the funding directed towards maintenance, preservation and operation of the state controlled network.

We also have very extensive commitments right throughout the state, particularly in terms of sealing roads that are unsealed. Having such a vast state and having the most decentralised population in the country means that we do have a vast network. We have been very happy to work with local councils. We have a western roads supplement in this year's budget of \$5 million. I was very happy to be out there with the mayor of Blackall-Tambo. He was very pleased to see their roads benefit from an allocation. I know there is continued sealing going on in the member for Traeger's area—the Hann Highway, an area ignored by many governments but not this government. We are sealing the Hann Highway, and there is a whole range of other western roads that we are also sealing. We want to make sure that we continue to improve our road network right across the state.

Mr MINNIKIN: Minister, given the popularity of Bribie Island as a tourist destination, can you explain why \$1 million was cut from the design work on the Saint to Hickey Road upgrade along Bribie Island Road and why the delivery date of this project was subsequently delayed by a year?

Mr BAILEY: I will probably have to take that one on notice specifically and come back to the committee with some details to see whether in fact the situation that you have outlined is accurate or not. I might have a bit of information here that has come to hand. Can you repeat what roads you are talking about?

Mr MINNIKIN: Saint to Hickey Road.

Mr BAILEY: I do have some information, so I will save the committee some time. The Department of Transport and Main Roads is currently seeking further detail from the Australian government's \$20 million funding commitment to Caboolture-Bribie Island Road announced recently. However, my department is currently undertaking a \$2 million planning project to upgrade a two-lane section of the Caboolture-Bribie Island Road to a four-lane median divided carriageway between the Hickey Road and Saint Road intersections. This planning, which includes the Old Toorbul Point Road intersection, is expected to be completed by early 2019.

In addition, a design is currently underway to boost motorist and pedestrian safety along Caboolture-Bribie Island Road between the Kal Ma Kuta Drive and Bestmann Road East intersections in Ningi. The \$755,000 Safer Roads Sooner project will help to address the increasing rate of crashes being recorded along this section of road. Works will include installing a pedestrian refuge, new lighting on the Caboolture-Bribie Island Road near Kal Ma Kuta Drive and road widening to accommodate a wide centre line treatment. Provision for a U-turn manoeuvre will also be provided at the Bestmann Road East intersection, providing a safer alternative for motorists exiting Spinnaker Drive and wanting

to travel westward towards Caboolture. The safety improvements from this project will significantly benefit the community and road users in this area. Once this design is complete, construction works are anticipated to start later this year.

Mr MINNIKIN: In relation to the time frame for the Queensland government to submit its proposal to the federal government with regard to the \$20 million of funding, when will that likely take place, Minister?

Mr BAILEY: It depends on the federal government. We have sought contact with them. Until we hear information from them and negotiate with them, I am not at liberty to say. When I do find out, I am happy to inform the committee.

Mr MINNIKIN: I would appreciate that.

Mr KATTER: Minister, with reference to page 4 of the SDS, does the government have any plans to increase regulation and limit transshipping in Queensland, particularly in areas outside the Great Barrier Reef?

Mr BAILEY: With our commitment to protecting the Great Barrier Reef, we have some provisions within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. We very much support that. This is a matter essentially for Minister Enoch. I am happy to get some more details and come back to you.

Mr KATTER: You have probably answered by next question: is there a proposed date for the implementation of the government's new plans in relation to transshipping?

Mr BAILEY: This is a matter for Minister Enoch. I am happy to refer your query to Minister Enoch to respond.

Mr KATTER: My next question relates to page 21 of the SDS. In August 2017 a group comprising major mining companies in the north-west wrote to the Premier and Treasurer highlighting the fact that investment potential and competitiveness are being undermined by regulatory and pricing mechanisms applied by GOCs and commercialised statutory authorities and lack of competition through third-party access to key infrastructure. Does the minister accept that the current regulatory arrangements for pricing access to the Townsville-Mount Isa rail line are negatively impacting economic activity in Townsville and the North West Minerals Province?

Mr BAILEY: The first thing I would like to outline is that, because the current Palaszczuk Labor government was elected, we stopped the privatisation of the Mount Isa-Townsville rail line which was proposed by the previous LNP Newman government. That is a strong foundation that I think means a better outcome for users. The Palaszczuk Labor government is committed to ensuring that rail freight services are available to support and grow local economies, particularly in north and north-west Queensland and in regional and rural areas. That is why the intermodal access charges for commercial operators on the Mount Isa line have not changed for several years, other than CPI adjustments.

The access charges that apply to the Queensland Rail network, including the Mount Isa line, are regulated by the Queensland Competition Authority, which is an independent statutory body. We know that rail lines provide a critical link for local businesses and communities. Access revenue is important to support the maintenance and asset renewal of the Mount Isa line so that rail remains a reliable link in the North West Minerals Province export supply chain.

Queensland Rail continues to work with companies in the north-west to retain and build as much freight business on rail as possible. We are committed to improving rail infrastructure along the Mount Isa line and we will invest \$380 million in capital upgrades and maintenance work over five years. We invested \$62 million last financial year to improving the performance, safety and reliability of the 1,000-kilometre-long line. In 2018-19, this includes \$63 million to be spent on maintenance work on the Mount Isa line, including \$20 million of capital investment on track infrastructure and renewals. This also includes an additional \$50 million of funding which has been allocated to continue rail replacement works, bridge upgrades, ballast replacement, new and improved passing loops and track upgrades and maintenance, fulfilling Labor's election commitment.

Queensland Rail continues to explore ways of improving the reliability of the network through innovative technology, including through weather-monitoring stations, overload and imbalance detectors, a new wheel impact load detector, hot box detectors and dragging equipment detectors. Queensland Rail prides itself as an important part of and major employer in the north-west community. It currently employs more than 80 track maintenance workers along the Mount Isa line alone—obviously all constituents of yours—who live locally, spend locally and are part of the community.

The Mount Isa line is a critical connector for the communities in Queensland's north-west and one of the state's key freight paths. Queensland Rail is committed to ensuring it meets the needs of communities and freight operators. QR is progressing a concept plan to allow double stacking on railway wagons—that is, a container plus a half-height container—operating on the Mount Isa line. This will enable more efficient loading and higher intermodal train loads on the corridor to make the rail more productive and more competitive with road transport.

The project scope involves lowering the rail under four road overbridges between Stuart, near Townsville, and Mount Isa to increase the allowable loading gauge. Site investigations include geotechnical analysis being conducted to enable detailed design work to be undertaken. Consultation has occurred with Mount Isa line rail operators who support the project. Queensland Rail is actively involved in discussions with the rail operators and end customers to support the provision of additional above-rail capacity on the Mount Isa line.

I can also inform the committee that the current QCA declaration over the Queensland Rail network is under review as it is due to expire in September 2020. As part of this review process, Queensland Rail is required to make submissions regarding the current declaration. Queensland Rail recently submitted to the QCA's 2020 declaration review that the organisation's regional freight network should no longer be governed by future declarations on the basis that it no longer met the criteria for inclusion. Queensland Rail submitted that, on the basis that QR services are not declared, Queensland Rail will provide open access to its systems in accordance with a binding and enforceable access framework. There is a bit more information there, but I think that has been a pretty comprehensive response, as I know the member is very interested in this issue.

Mr KATTER: Thank you for the response, Minister, and it was comprehensive. I have a supplementary question. Of those figures—\$63 million, \$20 million and \$50 million for replacement—can you advise how much is recovered by the users? I understand that it is a unique piece of track and it is not subsidised. A lot of that cost goes back into the price to the users. Can you confirm that?

Mr BAILEY: I might call up the CEO of Queensland Rail, Mr Easy, who might like to comment on that.

Mr Easy: You are right. We have an access undertaking which is regulated by the Queensland Competition Authority, which is an independent statutory body. There is no transport services contract for the 1,000-kilometre Mount Isa line. In setting the charges and determining the prices under the access undertaking, that takes into account any maintenance or any asset renewal. The investment in the line does form part of the pricing and the considerations that are structured under the access undertaking.

Mr KATTER: Can you give an indication of how much? I believe that the majority of that cost is shifted back to the price. You just said that it does form part of it. Can you give us an indication of what proportion it is? Is it most or a little bit?

Mr Easy: The access undertaking takes into account all investment on the line. Any maintenance or asset renewals form part of the access undertaking and the pricing regime. There is a tariff that is set on the line. We talk with each of the customers and the users on the network in setting the commercial arrangements to enable and facilitate use on the line.

Mr KATTER: That is a unique characteristic of that line—

Mr Easy: It is. That is correct.

Mr KATTER:—as opposed to the rest of your network?

Mr Easy: The unique part of it is that it is not funded through the TSC. It is controlled by the access undertaking approved by the Queensland Competition Authority.

Mr KATTER: I have one last question on that, and it might be better directed to the director-general. Mr Scales, in response to a lot of that volume now going on to road, have levies been applied to users to make rail more competitive again?

009 Mr Scales: I thank the honourable member for the question. If someone is going to use the network and has several thousand tonnes or several hundreds of thousands of tonnes of product to be moved—more than 50,000 tonnes is the cut-off—they are required to undertake a road safety and pavement impact assessment. I think that is the question you are getting at.

Mr KATTER: Yes.

Mr Scales: If they are going to impact on the road network they are going to access that and then they have to provide a maintenance contribution based on our assessment which TMR's engineers

would check. That is under the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014 and the 2016 regulation.

CHAIR: Member, I hate to interrupt your train of thought but we are due to break now. Do you have one brief question to follow up?

Mr KATTER: Yes. I think you might have answered it.

Mr Scales: Through the chair, I can probably add this other bit. From 1 February 2017 to 31 January 2020 we have got through the north-west district of TMR a road compensation agreement with Glencore for its haulage. In other words, we have assessed there have been more than 50,000 tonnes on the road and we have come up with a maintenance figure and Glencore will have to pay that.

Mr KATTER: That has partly answered the question. Is that in response to increased volume on the roads away from rail?

Mr Scales: It is just whatever is on the roads. It could be new product; it could be anything. This particular case is road haulage for lead mineral product from Mount Isa to Townsville. There is a contribution there to managing any impact on our pavement.

CHAIR: The committee will now adjourn for a break. This hearing will resume at 11.30 am with the continued examination of the estimates for the Transport and Main Roads portfolio.

Proceedings suspended from 11.01 am to 11.30 am.



CHAIR: The hearing is resumed. Welcome back, Minister and officials. The committee will now continue its examination of the proposed expenditure for the Transport and Main Roads portfolio. Minister, do you have any answers to questions on notice or anything you want to say?

Mr BAILEY: With your indulgence, Mr Chair, I would like to clarify my opening statement. I referred to 37 external driver recruits receiving offer letters from Queensland Rail. The correct number of successful applicants was, in fact, 36. Before we start again, can I seek your indulgence to follow up a reference to the member for Bundamba's earlier question to the director-general? The Palaszczuk government has consistently said that we would bring the rail extension to Redbank Plains and Ripley. We remain committed to building this extension. We have planned and preserved that land for a future passenger rail line. It has been preserved since 2009 following extensive community consultation.

The corridor is also identified as a future public transport corridor in strategic documents such as the South East Queensland's Rail Horizon and ShapingSEQ. This extension is reliant on the completion of Cross River Rail, which the LNP would have scrapped had it won the recent election. Cross River Rail will enable us to unclog the bottleneck in the middle of the network and allow us to construct these vital connections delivering extra services. Cross River Rail is the catalyst for the expansion of the rail network through the South-East Queensland region. While many people think Cross River Rail is about the inner city, it will be as important to the outer metropolitan areas of South-East Queensland. The second rail crossing through the city will allow the expansion of vital rail connections in areas like Ipswich and Logan.

Mrs MILLER: Minister, it still does not alter the fact that the director-general said there is no-one working on these projects at the moment. I understand what you are saying—

CHAIR: Member, you will have to wait until it is your turn to ask a question. I am just letting the minister make the statement. You will no doubt have a follow-up question on that when we get there. I now turn to the member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: I refer to page 15 of the SDS and ask the minister to provide an update on the Northern Transitway, which I am particularly interested in, and the Eastern Transitway and explain how they will benefit commuters.

Mr BAILEY: I thank the member for the question. Labor is committed to congestion-busting public transport infrastructure like Cross River Rail, light rail and now bus transitways. The eastern and northern transitways are a \$75 million commitment to improve travel times and ensure tens of thousands of commuters can spend more time at home and less time on the road. They build on about 29 kilometres of busway that already exist, all of which was built under previous Labor governments.

The Northern Transitway will provide a high-quality public transport corridor from Gympie Road from Kedron to Chermside. This project will deliver targeted bus priority from Sadlier Street, Kedron to Hamilton Road, Chermside, improving the safety and capacity of this important link in the transport network. Commuters coming from the north side of Brisbane will benefit from high-frequency on-road bus services and more reliable travel times. This will also encourage more people to use public transport and assist in managing congestion along the corridor and broader transport network.

The Palaszczuk government has committed \$53 million to deliver the Northern Transitway. The department has undertaken a review of the previous planning and commenced surveying along the corridor. Surveying is expected to finish shortly. The tender for the detailed design contract has been released, with this stage expected to commence in late 2018. Contract award for construction is planned for late 2019, with construction expected to commence in early 2020. Community consultation and key stakeholder engagement will be undertaken during the detailed design.

The Eastern Transitway will deliver bus priority improvements between Main Avenue, Coorparoo and Creek Road, Carindale. The \$22 million investment is set to provide a high-quality public transport corridor on Old Cleveland Road at this key local area and provide access to the city from suburbs to the east. The bus priority measures will be aimed at improving bus service reliability and travel times in peak periods which will assist in managing congestion along the corridor. The Department of Transport and Main Roads advise that survey work for the Eastern Transitway has commenced. Let us not forget that the former LNP government promised to deliver improvement in the Eastern Transitway contingent on the selling of assets which was an empty promise. The Palaszczuk government is building the Eastern Transitway without asset sales, with survey works along the corridor already underway to be followed by detailed design.

We are fully funding the transitways and getting on with the job of building them as part of what has been a very strong record already over the last 3½ years of building public transport infrastructure in our state.

Mrs MILLER: Minister, I thank you for your clarification in relation to my other questions. I would now like to ask a question in relation to the rail expansion to Ripley in the context of the fact that developers in Ripley are telling local people that the rail will be there in the next couple of years. Then people get very upset because it is a load of hogwash. How many officers are working on the project to extend the rail through to Ripley? What is the budget and what is the status of this project? Honestly, all we want is a straight-up answer. If it is on the never-never, tell us.

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for her question. In terms of the Redbank extension, work is happening on the rail network strategy which involves planning around that area. It is true that work is happening on that protected corridor. What developers tell people is not something we have any control over.

Mrs MILLER: I am well aware of that, but people believe them.

Mr BAILEY: I acknowledge your information in that regard, but we do not have control over that. If they are doing that in an inaccurate way, I certainly would not support that behaviour. I might ask my director-general to comment further in terms of the Ripley issue that you have just raised.

Mr Scales: I thank the honourable member for the question. What we should probably do in this case is get the gazetted corridor. Once we have the gazetted corridor I can show you exactly what we have in terms of land protection in that particular area. As the minister says, this feeds into the 10-year strategy. If developers are saying that rail is going to turn up in two years it is laughable, because two years on the railway is just a heartbeat. With my minister's leave, it is probably something we can do in detail when I come out and visit your constituency. I will bring the corridor maps as well.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you very much. We now know that the Redbank Plains-Ripley extension is a long way off—and thank you for being honest in relation to that. A lot of people in Redbank Plains, Ripley and Bellbird Park whip down the back road and use the Springfield railway station, which is good because we want people on public transport but the issue is the car park. We know that there have been promises in relation to the car park there. Based on calculations that I have worked out, the car park will cost \$64,000 per individual car park. What my people want to know is: can some consideration be given to building a multistorey car park, bearing in mind your previous answer? We need to have car-parking spaces of several hundred if not thousands.

This is a result of the disgraceful planning of the department of transport years ago in relation to Springfield in my area when they said that everyone should walk or catch a bus to the local train stations. I told them that was hogwash because young families in my area are not going to drop the kids off to school, put the pram on the bus, then go to a childcare centre, catch another bus and go to the train station. The planning has been a disgrace.

Mr BAILEY: Can I seek clarification? Member, were you advocating for a multistorey park at Springfield Central?

Mrs MILLER: Yes, one with car-parking spaces of several hundreds if not several thousand.

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for her question. I am very happy to report that as part of our platform going into the last election our commitment was to build 650 new spaces at Springfield Central Station, and it will be a new multistorey car park. The new capacity will total 1,100 car-parking spaces. There is very good news on that front that I can report for you.

Mrs MILLER: On another issue, I understand that Transport some years ago entered into an agreement for the Local Government Association of Queensland to manage Transport's road repairs in local government areas which has resulted in taking away the ability of councils to use local companies. I would like to know how much money is expected to be expended in relation to the agreement this year.

Mr Scales: I thank the honourable member for the question. There are 77 local councils in Queensland and the road maintenance asset contracts, as we call them, depend upon the capacity of that council to undertake the work. The government has restored TIDS, the Transport Infrastructure Development Scheme. That is a 50-50 fund between ourselves and the local authorities, all 77 of them, based on a number of regional roads and transport groups, so there is that work there as well.

On RAMCs—that is, road asset management contracts—it is a mixture. Some shires use RoadTek so the RoadTek people do the work. We contract various shires to do work as well. It depends on the sort of work we want them to do—whether the road is sealed or unsealed. If it is unsealed, it will require a totally different maintenance regime. It depends, really, where we are in terms of the state, how many roads are in the particular shire and what we are required to do with them, whether they do their own maintenance or whether we do them in concert with the local authority.

Bear in mind, as the minister said in one of his opening responses, that the state has 180,000 kilometres of road. We have 33,353 kilometres, so not all the roads in the shires are ours. What I am saying is that it is horses for courses, depending on their capability and what the contract is. I will probably be able to get you a number for RAMCs, with the minister's and the chair's indulgence, by the end of the session. I would have to break that down, unless you have a specific—

Mrs MILLER: No, I just want a global figure, even if it is appropriate.

Mr Scales: Through the chair, we can certainly get that for you. To get back to the question, it depends on the capacity of the local authority. It depends on what roads they are working on, whether it is ours or theirs. It depends on whether RoadTek has a contract, because they do certain contracts as well. I can tell you from experience in going around the country that some of the councils are not interested in doing the maintenance—they rely on RoadTek—whereas other councils see this as a way to keep people employed, so we try to balance it all up.

Mrs MILLER: I have a follow-up question in relation to the quality of the roadworks, particularly after floods or cyclones and particularly in relation to NDRRA funded works. I have been advised that there have been serious concerns about the quality of the work that has been undertaken to the point where some people have described it to me as being an open roort in relation to the NDRRA funded road repairs. What I am asking is: have any resources of Main Roads been put into a review of the quality of this sort of work?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for her question. I will make a few comments and then ask my director-general to add to that. One of the key things that we were very committed to on election was RoadTek. They do a fantastic job, particularly in regional Queensland where they know the road network so well. We have boosted the workforce there, with some of the contract workforce becoming permanent. I have seen twice now in very direct fashion how effective they have been in restoring roads after cyclone events—with Cyclone Marcia originally in 2015 and then Cyclone Debbie in 2017. Those RoadTek crew are just worth their weight in gold. They do a fantastic job in terms of immediate assessments and recovery. We have strong faith in their ability to respond. In terms of the quality of the NDRRA work, I will ask my director-general to comment on that more specifically.

Mr Scales: Thanks, Minister, and I thank the honourable member for the question. We do audit the product. If it is a contractor who does it or even if it is RoadTek who does it, the department will audit the quality of the product. If you have any specific issues, I am happy to take them offline. We do work very closely with the Queensland Reconstruction Authority. They are my partner in all of this. We do rapid damage assessments. As the minister said, RoadTek usually go in and sort out the connections first. I have to say that RoadTek are managing the Sarina Range reconstruction, where there was a very severe effect on that road with Tropical Cyclone Debbie.

The answer to the question is that we do audit. We do not do it just at the end; we continually audit when roadworks are being done. We make sure that the gravel is the right consistency. We ensure

as far as we can that we use new products that last much better after tropical cyclone effects. We use foamed bitumen, which has stood up quite well after a tropical cyclone. We also use EME2 which means you can use 25 per cent less depth and get the same wearing out of it. I am also pleased to inform the committee that we use crumbed rubber, so we are grinding up tyres as well.

All of these three types of products are available to contractors. The contractors have to be accredited, the bitumen has to be accredited, the gravel has to be accredited and then we audit it. If there is an individual issue anywhere on the network, I would be happy to take it up. At the end of the day, tropical cyclones do a tremendous amount of damage to this state, and we do two things: firstly, we reconnect the state up as soon as we possibly can; and, secondly, I hate going back and fixing things twice, so we try to make sure that we fix it once.

Mrs MILLER: That is because it costs more money, Director-General.

Mr Scales: Absolutely.

Mr MELLISH: I refer to page 87 of Budget Paper No. 4 and ask the minister to provide an update on the government's plans to work with stakeholders to clean up derelict vessels from waterways.

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am very proud to say that the Palaszczuk Labor government has just approved a \$20 million program over five years for the management of derelict vessels in Queensland's coastal waterways. This funding will be used to remove derelict vessels from our waterways. Most importantly, it will be put towards developing strategies aimed at changing the behaviour of vessel owners to reduce the recurrence of abandoned and derelict vessels.

I am also proud of our announcement earlier today that we are further upping the stakes on our war on wrecks and have created a crack task force to prioritise the worst vessels and remove them from our waterways. The task force will be chaired by our new member for Redlands, Kim Richards, and deputy chaired by the mayor of Douglas shire, Julia Leu—two people who are acutely aware of the damage these wrecks cause on our Queensland coastline. I want to ensure vessel owners understand and meet their responsibility, from maiden voyage to final mooring. More importantly, we want to ensure that negligent owners are held to account. I would just say here that most boat owners do the right thing and meet their responsibilities. We are talking about a small minority of people here who are doing these things that are of detriment to our environment.

The Palaszczuk Labor government knows how important boating is to Queenslanders, given that we have the highest per capita ratio of people having boats in the country. We have given considerable support for boating, including an additional \$30 million added to the Marine Infrastructure Fund included in this year's budget. A priority for the new \$20 million fund will be to remove and dispose of problematic ships and prevent other vessels becoming derelict in the future. The program is expected to inject much needed funding into small to medium sized businesses in regional Queensland.

My department is ultimately responsible for dealing directly with derelict and abandoned vessels in Queensland coastal waters and works closely with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, the Department of Environment and Science and local governments to do this. Vessel owners have a responsibility to maintain their vessels to a seaworthy standard and remove them from the water should they become wrecked. For those vessels posing an unacceptable risk to navigation or the environment and where the owner fails to act, my department will make every effort within its budgetary capacity to manage that vessel directly.

My department has recently managed the removal and disposal of three large derelict vessels. The *Whitsunday Magic* was a 34-metre steel sailing ship that was driven ashore in Pioneer Bay near Airlie Beach during Tropical Cyclone Oswald in January 2013. In spite of early attempts by the owner and local contractors to refloat the ship, it remained in place and deteriorated to a state where it was an eyesore and a danger to both the public and the environment. After a lengthy legal process, my department engaged contractors to break up the ship and transport its components to Townsville for recycling. This was completed in December 2017 at a cost of \$805,000.

Contractors were also engaged to remove and dispose of the 39-year-old motor ship *Tateyama Maru* that was driven aground on rocks in Bona Bay, Gloucester Island, during Tropical Cyclone Debbie in March 2017. My department managed removal of pollutants from the ship in May 2017, and in September the ship was successfully recovered and towed to Townsville for recycling in early December of last year. The total cost of removal of this ship and the pollutants that it contained was \$957,000—certainly not a small amount of money.

Another casualty of Tropical Cyclone Debbie was the 31-metre steel ship *MV Banks*, which was stranded on rocks in Cid Harbour, Whitsunday Island. My department managed the removal of oil and other pollutants from the ship in November 2017 and then removal of the ship itself just this month. Like the other two ships, *MV Banks* was taken to Townsville for disposal. All up, removal of pollutants from the ship, its recovery from Whitsunday Island and its disposal cost \$427,000.

The funding that has been approved for the derelict vessels program will help preserve the world-class environment of Queensland's coastlines and will help stimulate regional economies by providing business opportunities. It is important to note that owners are responsible for maintaining their vessels and having these vessels either repaired or removed from the water at no cost to the community should they become derelict and that Maritime Safety Queensland works with vessel owners to encourage them to remove their vessels.

CHAIR: Thank you, Minister. I welcome back the member for Maiwar and wonder if he has a question.

Mr BERKMAN: I do have a question for the minister. In an earlier answer, you identified a number of upgrade plans that will result in, I think you said, 83 per cent of train stations being independently accessible, but there are a number of stations, such as Taringa in my own electorate, where there appear to be no upgrade plans whatsoever. Minister, can you advise when there will be a detailed, time-bound and funded plan to upgrade all remaining stations in Queensland to ensure that they are independently accessible by the 2022 deadline imposed by the 1992 Disability Discrimination Act?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. Can I just clarify, first of all, that what I actually said was that 83 per cent of commuters would have access to an accessible station. It was not actually 83 per cent of stations.

Mr BERKMAN: Okay.

Mr BAILEY: The very nature of upgrades to accessibility of stations over time has been that obviously the higher volume stations were targeted earlier on across successive governments. Basically, the biggest stations were done and we are working our way through the others. It was actually 83 per cent of passengers, not of actual stations, that have been done.

The Palaszczuk government believes in accessibility, and this includes to our passenger transport network. In terms of your own electorate, I understand Indooroopilly is an accessible station. The Auchenflower train station is something the Palaszczuk Labor government committed to upgrading, and that process is underway and in its early stages. The people who use Auchenflower station—which I know is close to the Wesley Hospital so some people use it to access that hospital—will benefit from the Palaszczuk Labor government's accessibility upgrade program. I believe you have Toowong in your electorate as well which is accessible. The only one beyond those three is Taringa. Of course there would be a range of stations across the network that still require accessibility upgrades. In that regard, I think it is fair to say that no state will meet that federal requirement in terms of having all of their stations fully accessible by that date, but Queensland is more advanced than other states.

We are doing that work as quickly as we can but it does take a little bit of time to do that, because you have to involve communities in the consultation and the design. In the case of Graceville station that has been upgraded and completed, there were heritage issues that had to be taken into account. You also have to keep the rail system open 24/7 or, depending on the station, a lot of the time so you have to work around those issues of operation throughout. You also have to keep all of the workers and the people who use the station safe throughout.

We are doing this work as quickly as we can. We are working with advocacy groups in terms of accessibility and design. We have the Accessibility Reference Group within Queensland Rail and also with Transport and Main Roads. We have a range of advocates there for people with different kinds of disabilities who give us advice on a range of issues, and we value their input very much. Your station of Auchenflower will be part of that commitment as part of a rolling program of \$300 million going into accessibility upgrades, which I look forward to us progressing.

Mr MINNIKIN: I refer specifically to page 11 of the SDS under 'Transport safety' and 'implementing road safety initiatives ... enforcement'. I ask the minister if the record fines being generated through the speed camera detection program are more a reflection of the Palaszczuk Labor government's focus on revenue-raising measures rather than attention to road safety.

CHAIR: Are you asking for an opinion there?

Mr MINNIKIN: No.

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. It does surprise me that the honourable member does not appear to understand the nature of the Camera Detected Offence Program. We use speed cameras as a way to save lives across our network. Speed is one of the 'fatal 5'. People die on our roads from speeding, sadly, on a regular basis. Speed cameras are a really important part of a wide array of actions that we bring into play to reduce our road toll, particularly on junctions.

Let me be very clear about this. If you do not want to get fined, you do not speed—full stop. I wish we had no revenue from speed cameras because nobody sped. I can assure you that if that was the case we would have an extraordinarily low road toll. I am very conscious and have been very conscious of my responsibilities as the minister responsible for road safety for the last 3½ years. It is very, very frustrating to see that more than 80 per cent of crashes that involve fatalities involve people making very poor decisions that increase their risk, and speeding is certainly one of those.

These cameras are installed to prevent deaths and serious injuries on our roads, and they are doing just that. An independent evaluation of the program found that they were directly responsible for preventing 3,400 serious casualty crashes per annum. The money that we raise from them is used to make roads safer, to support road safety education programs and to install flashing zone signs.

011 Potential locations for cameras are primarily identified by analysing sections of road with a history of crashes as a result of speeding, so it is evidence based—driving where we do these. This analysis determines the sites. It has nothing to do with revenue that might be received from that location. That has been the case across governments, to be quite fair. All of that revenue within this program must be spent on road safety measures, whether that is infrastructure—and we have a targeted road safety program that looks at the infrastructure that needs upgrading to prevent road crashes. We have the road safety education campaigns. These are all very important measures.

Of course, the most important thing in terms of preventing fatalities and serious trauma with hospitalisations cannot be ignored in the road toll because they are a tremendous cost to the community and affect people for the rest of their lives. Hospitalisations are also something we have to be serious about. We have to be serious and tough on speeding. Sadly, a lot of people think that they can speed a little bit and it will be okay, but it just is not. Speeding increases the risk for everybody on our roads. In terms of the honourable member's specific question here, the Camera Detected Offence Program sees that revenue go into road safety. That is something that I support, I will continue to support and I think all members should support because we have to keep working hard to get our road toll down. The fatalities and hospitalisations are totally unacceptable.

Mr MINNIKIN: You have tried to give a general response, but are you able to provide very specific road safety criteria as issued by Transport and Main Roads to Queensland Police Service in relation to the appropriate placement of speed cameras to ensure they are used for road safety purposes and not simply used for revenue raising—the specific road safety criteria?

Mr BAILEY: There is information that is related to that. Let's be very clear; the Camera Detected Offence Program, which funds road safety initiatives and infrastructure, is one of the most audited programs in the Department of Transport and Main Roads. I know it is an easy line to run out there and say it is about revenue, but the fact is that it is heavily audited; it is an important part of our response to trauma and fatalities on our road. I might ask the director-general to comment. I am happy to provide the committee with more information about that.

I have made recent announcements. Along with Minister Mark Ryan I visited Beerburrum Road and Morayfield Road. They are initiatives based on crash information that will improve those roads. Others that come to mind are the Mount Lindesay Highway and Gladstone-Benaraby Road. All have crash histories that have fed the investment by the Palaszczuk government to improve those roads. Some of those are experiencing higher volumes as we see growth; Mount Lindesay Highway is a good example of that. There certainly is information and criteria that guide that revenue into a safer road environment.

If we take a broader view on this issue over 30 to 40 years, we have seen the level of fatalities fall from about 30 per hundred thousand down to about five. There have been substantial gains over time for a whole lot of different reasons, particularly behavioural change around drink-driving and speeding—two very important ones. For those minority of crashes where you have an infrastructure issue that might not be appropriate anymore, that is where this money goes. Director-General, would you like to comment further?

Mr Scales: As the minister said, this program was audited by the QAO very recently. They determined that fixed camera sites were all very well but we should be doing something else. There

has been increasing use by the Road Policing Command and Commissioner Ian Stewart to actually move mobile cameras around. You do see them moved around and it is based on crash history and statistics. They are not just put in a certain place at the bottom of a bank where you can pick someone up; they are actually moved around, as the minister says, to reduce fatalities—and that is not the full story—and reduce the number of people who are seriously injured. Something like 6,400 people are seriously injured on our roads every year.

For the benefit of the committee, in the department we use the three Es: engineering, where we try to engineer out known blackspots—and there is a Black Spot Program to do that; education, and there is a whole series of strategies we use to educate people on the ‘fatal 5’; and enforcement, and the Camera Detected Offence Program is part of the enforcement. As the minister says, quite frankly, we would rather have zero from that and fewer road deaths. If people did not speed, they would not get fined. That money can only go into the areas the minister has outlined. It cannot be used on something else; it has to go in as prescribed to make the roads safer. To answer the question, it is based on crash history and statistics.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you, Mr Scales.

CHAIR: I will say on that, we went through that QAO report during the last parliament. Thanks, Minister. It is a good refresher.

Mr MINNIKIN: Yes, I am aware of that. I have a quick follow-up. Mr Scales, TMR conduct the reviews of the locations for the camera sites to ensure they are consistent with known blackspot locations. How often is that review undertaken?

Mr Scales: Obviously if we get a series of crashes at a particular site we will investigate that, anyway. If it is speed related, our colleagues in the police would get involved; the police would be helping to guide us on that. How often would depend upon the 33,353 kilometres of road we have and all the myriad junctions. It would be site-specific and dependent on incidents. If you got a spike you would go and have a look. That is not everything. In a number of locations we are also doing point-to-point cameras. You actually have detection of the numberplate registration at a point and it will see it on the way out. If you have exceeded the speed limit on a point-to-point—there are some in the tunnels and I think we are going to trial them on some of the highways soon. It is not actually a fixed point. Rather than a camera at a specific location where people slow down because they are signed and they know where they are unless they are mobile, it is about trying to encourage people to change their behaviour and keep to the speed limit on a point-to-point. It is not just the fixed ones or the mobile ones; we are trying point-to-point as well if that helps.

Mr MINNIKIN: Minister, I refer to the SDS pages 15 and 16, under Passenger Transport Services and delivering the new park-and-ride spaces across South-East Queensland. In terms of capacity constraints at the Mango Hill station, could you please advise this committee as to exactly what is happening with the government owned vacant land adjacent to the station and whether any proposed sale or disposal has been contemplated? If so, will you insist on provision of additional commuter parking as a condition of sale?

Mr BAILEY: Of course, we have a very extensive park-and-ride program in South-East Queensland, and I think I outlined that in my opening statement. We are very aware that the Mango Hill area is a very high growth area. In fact, an old friend of mine just moved there from Sydney, believe it or not. I am conscious of that. We have had very strong representations from our members here such as the current chair of the committee. Certainly the members for Murrumba and Bancroft are also strong advocates for this very high growth area.

The Department of Transport and Main Roads is aware of the overflow parking occurring on that land adjacent to Mango Hill rail station allocated for the transit orientated development. Additional commuter parking is currently being investigated and will form part of the final precinct. My department owns three parcels of vacant land adjacent to Mango Hill rail station totalling approximately 3.8 hectares. The land was allocated for transit orientated development as part of the Moreton Bay Rail Link project—obviously called the Redcliffe peninsula line now—and was released to market earlier this year via a competitive tender process.

The transit orientated development outcomes serve to provide a number of government and broader community benefits including increased active transport and public transport patronage; decreased car dependency; efficient use of transport infrastructure; and improved rail safety, security and accessibility.

The Redcliffe peninsula line delivered six new stations and a total of 2,850 commuter car parks. My department's records indicate that there is spare car-parking capacity available at Murrumba Downs rail station, located less than two kilometres, or a five-minute drive, from Mango Hill rail station. My department is committed to providing an integrated and efficient public transport network and acknowledges that park-and-ride facilities are an integral part of the network. As I have mentioned before, local members have been very strong in their advocacy for infrastructure in the area. While all three parcels are at the expression of interest stage, we will be reviewing this to ensure parking is increased.

Mr MINNIKIN: So a sale or disposal is being contemplated?

CHAIR: I believe the minister has answered that. Do you wish to add anything further?

Mr BAILEY: No. I think that is a pretty complete answer.

Mr MINNIKIN: This question is to the DG of TMR, Mr Scales. I refer to the SDS, page 7 and the service area highlights relating to continued construction on the M1. I ask whether any speed limit restrictions are still under consideration for the M1? If so, when can motorists expect notification of the outcome?

Mr Scales: The only time we have reduced the speed limits there was specifically for the Commonwealth Games, so a reduction of 10 kilometres per hour in each of the areas. There were other measures there as well. There are no plans to do anything more. What we are doing is a full review of the Commonwealth Games, which we will pass to the minister in due course, which includes an evaluation of what happened at that point. That will be a matter for the minister as to what happens with that. I can say that we restored the speed limits virtually overnight after the Commonwealth Games had finished and they are still where they were.

Mr MINNIKIN: It is my understanding that the review of the speed limits was due for release at the end of May this year. Has that been completed? Where is it at before it goes to the minister in terms of timeliness?

Mr Scales: It is wrapped up in the trucks using left-hand lanes, because I did not really want to go to half an answer. We are doing a more fulsome response. It is not that we are behind on this; we are just doing some more evaluation work. The evaluation work on trucks using left-hand lanes is being done by a consultant. It is not that it is delayed; it is just that it is a more comprehensive response for my minister.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you, Mr Scales.

Mr Scales: Chair, while I have the member for Chatsworth, I have the response to the question he asked that I took on notice about the cost of contractors of the bus contracts. As the minister advised, all 15 bus contracts with private operators delivering TransLink services in South-East Queensland have now been executed. We now have next-generation service contracts. The total service contract value for all private operators is \$2.19 billion and through the procurement and negotiation phases we saved \$459 million. We negotiated that out from the invitation to offer. This was done without compromising the benefits for the delivery partners, the state and also the travelling public. That is the context.

Based on our project cost records, because this process has been going on for three years, the cost that you are after is \$18.91 million. Because some of this is beyond this current financial year and goes back two financial years, this represents less than one per cent of the cost of contract, or 0.86 per cent. The contract costs include legal, as I said, commercial, financial advisers and commercial negotiations. These were skills that the department just simply did not have. The number you are after is \$18.91 million, and I have not been able to break it down within the timetable. I thought I would give you the context of how big the contracts were.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you, Mr Scales. Can I ask a question of the minister?

CHAIR: Just quickly.

Mr MINNIKIN: Yes, it is a very quick question. Minister, I have a very simple question. Can you rule out placing speed restrictions along the M1?

Mr BAILEY: In relation to the M1, I do remember that the honourable member suggested a lot of doomsday predictions about the Commonwealth Games which of course did not come to fruition whatsoever. It is the responsible thing to do to fully and thoroughly review all of the measures that we had in place as part of the Commonwealth Games. We made a commitment that we would restore the speed limit to its original limit after the games. That is exactly what we have done. We are looking at all

the measures to see whether there are any learnings in terms of managing the motorway well. Bear in mind, of course, that our significant infrastructure investments in the M1 will be significantly expanding the capacity at the Gateway merge, at Mudgeeraba to Varsity Lakes and then all the way to the border—six-laning it—after not a single new dollar was spent on the M1 by the previous LNP government during its three years in power. I still struggle to comprehend how that could have happened.

012 Nonetheless, the Palaszczuk government has had four upgrades funded on the M1 to date and they are already under construction between Mudgeeraba to Varsity Lakes and at the merge, as anybody who drives along the M1 there would know. We started and finished the exit 54 Coomera interchange upgrade, which is a substantial one, and we have an election commitment of course to upgrade the exit 57 Oxenford interchange with a \$25 million commitment and there is funding in this year's budget to do that as well. You can see that our commitment to the M1 has been in stark contrast to the previous government, of which the honourable member was an assistant minister, when they essentially did not spend a single new dollar on the most trafficked road in Queensland. I would have much greater confidence that this government understands the issues around the M1, how to manage it well and how to increase its capacity. We are getting on with that work. We are not making the same mistakes that were made when the honourable member was part of the Newman LNP government and we will continue to do so.

Mr MINNIKIN: So speed restrictions are not being ruled out. Thank you.

CHAIR: Thanks, Minister, for that. We will now move to the member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: Minister, in reference to page 3 of the SDS where it talks about the delivery of a substantial capital program, has TMR identified any project savings and, if so, what happens to the funds saved?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. The Palaszczuk Labor government is committed to delivering transport and road infrastructure right across our state at best value for Queenslanders. Since 2015 there have been significant savings realised for key transport and road infrastructure projects. Changes to the total project costs can occur for a range of reasons such as project delivery efficiencies, market conditions and project contingencies. We are always focused on delivering better bang for our buck and I am pleased to announce that we have achieved that on two very important regional projects.

In June 2016 under the State Infrastructure Fund \$34.2 million was committed to the Cairns Western Arterial Road for the Bill Fulton Bridge duplication by the Deputy Premier. The duplication of the Bill Fulton Bridge was completed last December on time and under budget, with \$16.3 million worth of savings. I can announce today that the Palaszczuk Labor government will keep the money in Cairns and will use savings from the Bill Fulton Bridge duplication to further upgrade the Cairns Western Arterial Road at the Harley Street intersection. The member for Barron River, who has been a very fierce advocate of road upgrades in this area, has often talked to me about how busy this road can get, particularly during school pick-up and drop-off times, and I am pleased that these savings from a well-managed project will help reduce congestion and increase safety in the Cairns road network on that west arterial. There is also great news for workers in Cairns who will benefit from the continued upgrade of this road and we will be progressing to construction as soon as possible, creating a considerable number of jobs.

I am also pleased to announce today to the committee that we achieved savings on our \$40 million commitment to replace timber bridges on the Dawson Highway, which I know will be of particular interest to the member for Callide as that is in his electorate. We have replaced four longstanding timber bridges at Nine Mile Creek, Catfish Creek, Sheep Station Creek, Maxwellton Creek and Doubtful Creek. The first of the new bridges opened to traffic in December of last year, with construction efficiencies achieved by the contractor. Site works were accelerated to enable the remaining four bridges to open to traffic in April 2018. The complete construction of all five bridges in just 12 months despite two flash floods in 2017, inundating the work sites, is a tribute to the technical capability of Golding Contractors which delivered the project.

This project delivers immediate regional freight efficiency improvements and flood immunity of the Dawson Highway. Replacing these five timber bridges has resulted in a wider Dawson Highway, increasing safety for all road users. The weight limits on these timber bridges were a major inhibitor to the region's freight operations, with some vehicles travelling hundreds of additional kilometres via Rockhampton. I note that while being in the seat of Callide it was the Palaszczuk Labor government that delivered these bridge replacements, not the previous government. We are already looking at

opportunities to reinvest savings from this project, which are about \$14 million—so substantial—into further upgrades of the Dawson Highway to deliver roads, safety and accessibility improvements.

With the significant agricultural production and Queensland's largest multicommodity port at Gladstone, the reinvestment of \$14 million in project savings will see further works towards building a highway suitable for larger freight vehicles to access national and international markets. Just this week I was pleased to join federal Minister Fletcher to announce that savings on the Ipswich Motorway upgrade between Rocklea and Darra has enabled the Palaszczuk Labor government to expand the scope of this project. The Boundary Road connection would have remained out of scope if not for the project team's thorough competitive market tendering and project planning process. This included getting the best possible value for money by identifying critical issues such as early land use requirements and proactive service relocation works. This means we can deliver the additional large-scale Boundary Road connection and associated local upgrade works within the current budget.

To give you an idea, this additional extension will mean that the 6,500 vehicles that currently have to use this to go on and off the motorway will no longer have to do so. They will be able to have their own connection. Because we have made those savings on this project, it means 6,500 fewer vehicles on the Ipswich Motorway. In a context where there are 85,000 movements there, that is going to be a substantial time saving for everybody who uses the Ipswich Motorway, let alone those people who will have time savings because they did not have to go on the motorway at all. I am very pleased to see these very large savings on three very big projects occur that are seeing us get more bang for our buck across our road network and it is a credit to all those involved in the department that we have been able to achieve these savings and this additional value for money.

CHAIR: Thanks very much, Minister. From one Boundary Road to another one—the Boundary Road project in my electorate. I was wondering if you could provide us with an update on the completion of that.

Mr BAILEY: I certainly can, Chair, and I thank you for your question and your interest in the Boundary Road project. I thank the member for Kallangur for delivering on this vital piece of road infrastructure for his electorate. It would be remiss of me not to also mention Chris Whiting, the member for Bancroft, for his strong advocacy on behalf of his community as well. This \$100 million piece of infrastructure, jointly funded by the state and federal government, has completely transformed the Boundary Road interchange on the Bruce. It enables traffic to move faster, reducing delays and greatly benefiting local commuters, cyclists, pedestrians and local businesses within the area.

The bridge is six lanes wide, with four dedicated left slip lanes to provide access to the Bruce Highway on-ramp. During construction it supported more than 100 jobs, part of which was the installation of 68 bridge girders—a massive project—and this upgrade with its shared user path for pedestrians and cyclists is helping make this part of Brisbane more liveable for people now and future generations and is part of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to make sure active transport is included in major road projects. That is something every government should be doing forevermore. It is such a good project—such a proud legacy—that it seems some people just cannot help but try to take credit for it. Unfortunately for so-called 'Big Trev' Ruthenberg, or 'Big Fib Trev' as I refer to him, this has meant being caught—

Mr MINNIKIN: I raise a point of order relating to relevance to the proceedings today.

CHAIR: We are talking about the project. Minister, are you on the project?

Mr BAILEY: I certainly am talking about the project. There is certainly a claim he made specifically in media, and that is what I am referring to. Unfortunately Trevor Ruthenberg has been caught out telling yet another fib. The LNP candidate for Longman has been caught claiming credit for funding—

Mr SORENSEN: I raise a point of order.

CHAIR: What is your point of order?

Mr BAILEY:—the \$100 million Boundary Road project—

CHAIR: Sorry, but there is a point of order. What was your point of order?

Mr SORENSEN: I find that offensive.

CHAIR: What did you find offensive?

Mr BAILEY: It was not about you.

CHAIR: Could you please—

Mr BAILEY: Sorry; I would seek your clarification, Chair: that was not in reference to the member for Hervey Bay, so I do not believe he can take offence to it.

CHAIR: Okay. There is no point of order.

Mr BAILEY: The LNP candidate for Longman has been caught claiming credit for funding the \$100 million Boundary Road project when he was the member for Kallangur under Campbell Newman on his Facebook video. Apparently, Big Trev is not content with making bogus claims about war medals. He now needs to fib about his record as an MP when he served in Campbell Newman's government.

Mr SORENSEN: I raise a point of order. What relevance has that got to do with the budget?

CHAIR: Yes. Can we just come back to the bridge please?

Mr BAILEY: Yes, certainly, Mr Chairperson. I am simply outlining this achievement and who is responsible, so credit where credit is due. You certainly were a strong advocate and it was funded under the Palaszczuk government's first term in office. It certainly received no government funds during the Newman years and any claims by Big Trev to the contrary are absolutely untrue and inaccurate and it would be remiss not to point this out, especially given that he is now attempting to go into the federal parliament claiming the work of other people who achieved these including, you, Chair, and not on his watch.

Mr SORENSEN: What a load of rubbish!

CHAIR: Please do not interject.

Mr MELLISH: I am trying to listen to the answer.

CHAIR: Yes. Please stop your interjections.

Mr SORENSEN: It is a load of rubbish.

CHAIR: You are entitled to your opinion, but please keep quiet. The minister is answering a question.

Mr BAILEY: There was no funding allocated by the Newman LNP government to the Boundary Road interchange project in any shape or form throughout their term, so claims by Mr Ruthenberg to hand in other people's homework and claim it as his own seems to be happening on multiple fronts and I think it is appropriate that the people of Longman be aware of that.

CHAIR: Thanks, Minister.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Chairperson, I will close my remarks by congratulating you and congratulating Chris Whiting, the member for Bancroft, for being fierce advocates for this. You delivered the funding in the first term of the Palaszczuk government. All of the residents in the area are benefiting from that right now and it is a great credit to your hard work. Congratulations.

CHAIR: Thank you, Minister. It used to reside with the member for Kallangur at the time but it is now split three ways—Bancroft, Kurwongbah and Murrumba. That bridge spans all three electorates, so we are all very grateful. We will now go to the member for Bundamba for a question.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you very much, but I think the director-general has something to say.

CHAIR: Sorry.

Mr Scales: I refer to the previous question the member put forward on Aberdare Street. I have some further and better particulars. I can advise that Aberdare Street is cleaned twice a year and then RoadTek also responds on an as needs basis. In the previous financial year cleaning was undertaken another four times at selected locations across Aberdare Street. I am pleased to say we have programmed another round of cleaning for the week of 30 July, so next week. Chair, this is in relation to the pictures the member tabled of Aberdare Street.

CHAIR: Yes.

Mr Scales: On the second issue, which is the vehicles losing dirt and material on Aberdare Street, that is obviously a compliance issue and we will investigate it further and TMR is planning to check load restraint operations in the area.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you.

Mr Scales: I have some more as well. Shall I keep going?

Mrs MILLER: Yes, good.

CHAIR: Please do.

Mr Scales: We have carried out onsite investigations at the intersection of the Cunningham Highway off-ramp and Aberdare Street itself in Dinmore. We have looked at speed signs to make sure that is not contributing towards material being deposited on the road and associated warning signings on the Cunningham Highway off-ramp leading to Aberdare Street have been appropriate. We think the signage is all right. All traffic from Aberdare Street to Brisbane Road is observed to be operating at a safe level, so we think the speed is okay and we think people are operating safely. We have checked the crash records as well. There is no recorded crash history at this intersection, so as we said earlier we will have some more interventions there just to make sure that the load restraints are right and there are not things dropping off on to the road surface.

Mrs MILLER: It is the mud.

CHAIR: Thank you. Member, did you have another question?

Mrs MILLER: Yes, I do; thank you very much, Chair. I want to ask the minister this. It has just come through to me by email. Minister, in terms of the terms of reference of the Forde inquiry that has been announced this morning, Commissioner Forde can access any documents and conduct interviews but he may not conduct hearings. What I have been asked by people in my electorate to ask you is whether members of the community can make submissions to the Forde inquiry and whether those submissions will be made public. I ask you to give me some guidance for my constituents please.

013

CHAIR: I know that there is no sub judice or anything. I ask the minister to be aware.

Mr BAILEY: No, I am very happy to answer. I thank the honourable member for the question. The answer to that is yes. People will be able to make submissions to Mr Forde's inquiry. I am very pleased to see it. As Minister for Transport, I welcome it. I look forward to the work that he is going to be doing in the second half of this year.

Mrs MILLER: Chair, I have a question in relation to Goodna Special School, which is a wonderful school in my area, but it is located on a very busy road. Cars whizz by along Queen Street. On behalf of the P&C, the principal, the teachers and the support staff, I ask when a school crossing may be constructed.

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. Is it a local council road or is it a state controlled road?

Mrs MILLER: No, Queen Street at Goodna is a local council road, but they have been asking for several decades for a school crossing and it has now become quite an issue. The school has asked me to ask you directly whether you could help the school and the parents of these wonderful children to be safe on the road.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you, member, for the question. I am certainly happy to look into that matter. From a state government point of view, our flashing lights program is a fantastic program. We put in 100 of those every year. Once we complete this year's program, there will be 900 schools with that. Obviously, with so many schools I cannot remember that specific school off the top of my head. That flashing lights program really enforces school zones. We are happy to follow that through and have a look at it and raise it at the local government level as well and report back to you. That is not a problem. Do you want to comment on that?

Mr Scales: It sounds like an opportunity for a site visit, I think.

Mrs MILLER: Absolutely. Minister, you might get some more sense out of the council once an administrator is appointed. I have a follow-up question in relation to the third railway line that was funded to go through to Redbank. Can Nick Easy or someone else advise my community of the progress in relation to that third railway line?

Mr BAILEY: Sure.

Mrs MILLER: The CEO of QR?

Mr Scales: We are just trying to work out whose question it is. I think it might be mine.

Mrs MILLER: Okay.

Mr Scales: Thanks very much for the question. I will have to take advice on that specific one and try to get back to you before the end of the session. You are after information on progress on that particular line itself in terms of construction?

Mrs MILLER: Construction particularly, because several years ago it was announced that there would be a third railway line coming through to Redbank and we have not heard anything about it for a long time. People in my area want to know what is going on in relation to that.

Mr Scales: Yes. Thank you very much for the clarification. The detail is we have probably gazetted that. Therefore, as I said, with other rail projects it will form part of the 10-year rail strategy and be a component of that, I am sure.

Mrs MILLER: If I can just make this general comment, people in the community have no idea what 'gazetted' means. Even though we in here in this chamber understand what that means, when a government—any government, that is—starts talking about building a railway line and gazetting it, people think it is going to happen tomorrow. Any update would be good.

Mr Scales: Yes.

Mrs MILLER: I would like to know what on earth is going on with the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing in relation to the number of workplace safety incidents there.

CHAIR: That is not a quick question, but anyway—

Mrs MILLER: I am happy for you to take it on notice, because I have had a number of people contact me in relation to the safety issues on that site.

CHAIR: The question is about what is happening with safety.

Mr BAILEY: That is fine. Before I do that, on indulgence from the chair, I will give you a bit more information to a previous answer. I understand that Michael Forde will determine if submissions will be made public on the basis that some people would be happy for them to be so and that is all good. Some people may not. We want to give people that respect. Some people might want to submit it and it not be made public. That is just to clarify that.

In terms of the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing, I tabled a response to the committee that was fairly extensive about some of the issues up there. I draw the member's attention to that. I can make a couple of comments here in relation to some of the safety issues up there. As one of the responsible ministers, I was very concerned that we were seeing too many issues around rollovers up there. That is why Minister Grace and I met with senior management and also worker representatives earlier this year to make our point very clear that the issues that we have been raising through the usual departmental channels did not appear to be improving things. We went up there to have that very frank—and it was very frank—discussion about what our expectations were.

We expect a project of that size and magnitude by a company of that calibre to have absolute best practice safety provisions. I do not want to see any injuries on-site or workers at risk. We made that point very clear. I commissioned an audit that Prensa did through the department of main roads. They went in and thoroughly investigated it and came out with 51 recommendations, which Nexus has agreed to and is implementing. Minister Grace, from the occupational health and safety point of view, also instituted a range of provisions on them. I thank her for her role.

Sadly, we saw another incident occur where some metal bars were dropped from a large height near the viaduct. For the benefit of the committee, there is a range of very large viaducts being constructed. They landed on another vehicle. That was a source of great concern to us. A stop-work order was put in by the department and work was stopped around the viaducts for nearly a month to ensure that the provisions on-site were in place because, clearly, that is totally unacceptable. We had to be satisfied that those changes were in place before we allowed work to continue around the viaduct. We are continuing to monitor the situation and to work with Nexus on this. The director-general has been very involved in this. I might ask him to make a couple of comments as well.

Mr Scales: I thank the minister and I thank you very much for the question. It has been a source of concern. It is a 41-kilometre new road. There are lots of really detailed structures, as the minister said. One was a viaduct, so we issued a stop-work order. When it is constructed it will provide a really good link from Toowoomba to the port, certainly for heavy vehicles. It will be a very good piece of infrastructure. We keep on having very serious discussions with the contractor. We keep on pushing them along.

Mrs MILLER: Can I ask that you keep reading the riot act to this company, because what they have been doing is below standard?

Mr Scales: Thank you very much for the additional question. As the minister said, we have had some very full and frank discussions. In fact, they have removed one of their senior staff and replaced them with somebody else who is very experienced in health and safety matters. As the minister has also said, we got Prensa to do the report. There were 51 recommendations, which have all been accepted. We published that report on our website as soon as we got it and we continue to monitor things on a very regular basis.

Mr BAILEY: To add to that, Nexus has commenced the implementation of a structure safety improvement plan on the back of us going into bat very hard on the safety of workers.

CHAIR: I think the safety on that project is important to all of us. We will now go to the member for Chatsworth.

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is to the director-general, Mr Scales. I refer to your previous public statements that, under the NGR contract, the right trains were ordered. That was on ABC Radio back in November 2016. You still stand by that statement?

Mr Scales: Thank you very much for the question. Yes, I do.

Mr MINNIKIN: I have a further question to the CEO of Queensland Rail with reference to page 15 of the SDS relating to public transport services. Given that the Railway and Transport Strategy Centre at Imperial College in London cites best practice driver productivity and plate time at much higher than levels of 30 per cent, roughly, for Queensland Rail performance, why are Queensland Rail train crew being paid generously each year while at the same time productivity has shown no signs of improvement?

Mr Easy: I thank the honourable member for the question. Footplate time is an important measure of productivity on the network, as are a number of other measures. We monitor that over the course of any given year. It is calculated on the amount of time that drivers spend driving a revenue service relative to total working hours. In the last financial year, Queensland Rail train crew recorded an average of 33.83 per cent footplate time. That is to June 2018.

Queensland Rail train crew are also required to perform many different duties during each shift to ensure the safe and effective operation of the Citytrain network, which delivers 7,100 services per week. In addition to revenue services, these duties include positioning units to commence revenue services across the network, preparing the trains for service and undertaking safety checks, mandatory training and competencies and conducting guard duties, including shunting and the stabling of trains. Train crew may also be required to travel the network to join a revenue service, relieve a fellow driver or return to their home depot at the completion of a shift. A number of factors can influence driver productivity, including the number of available train crew to perform scheduled services as well as service alterations, such as the school holiday timetable provision.

Mr MINNIKIN: What impact would the crib breaks, the walk time, the rest period and the lunchbreaks have on overall productivity? What other measures have been considered as a way of lifting train driver productivity?

Mr Easy: I thank the honourable member for the follow-up question. I think the important thing with the meal break is that it is a provision within the enterprise agreement. It is a legal commitment between the parties. Our intention is to honour that agreement and implement the meal breaks.

Mr MINNIKIN: Why is it that Queensland Rail is paying a train driver more dollars for less productivity?

Mr Easy: The payment to the train drivers is based on the provisions within the enterprise agreement. There is a three per cent per annum increase, which is locked into the enterprise agreement. That is what we would be paying as an employer.

Mr MINNIKIN: In February next year, there will be two-by-30-minute crib breaks?

Mr Easy: That is correct. At the moment, the drivers have a one-by-40-minute meal break. Subject to the conclusion of the agreement and implementing the new master roster, that will move to two 30-minute meal breaks.

Mr MINNIKIN: Thank you. I have a question to the minister.

Mr Easy: If I could take the liberty to answer a question that I took on notice previously?

Mr MINNIKIN: Sorry, yes.

Mr Easy: If that is possible while I am here?

CHAIR: Yes. That will save us time later.

Mr Easy: This was a question to do with consultants. In the last financial year, the Queensland government committed \$25 million to fixing the trains and to implement the recommendations from the Strachan commission of inquiry. The budget is allocated for a range of activities and not just consultants, but past and future consultant spends will be captured as part the budget to develop the required assurance, forecasting and modelling tools that have enabled Queensland Rail to stabilise services and deliver more than 95 per cent of trains on time for each quarter last financial year. These

new tools have assisted with planning for stress periods. In the most recent June-July school holidays, these tools supported Queensland Rail in achieving no timetable downgrade for the first time since the Strachan commission of inquiry.

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is to the minister. With reference to page 11 of the SDS under the heading 'Transport Safety and Regulation', the safety of transport networks, and page 15 of the SDS under the heading 'Passenger Transport Services', can you explain to this committee why 2017 was the worst year in almost a decade for signals passed at danger, known as SPAD?

014 **Mr BAILEY:** I thank the honourable member for the question. Can I just add a little to the previous question and answer? The reporting of driver productivity occurred for the first time in response to the Strachan recommendations via the city's train response unit. The number of 33.8 per cent compares favourably to, for instance, the average driver productivity in 2013 of 28.9 per cent which was there under the member for Chatsworth when he was the assistant minister for public transport.

Mr MINNIKIN: On-time running.

Mr BAILEY: A sizeable difference there of five per cent in those two figures. I think that was worth noting. In terms of signals passed at danger, we certainly take safety on the rail network very seriously. Every single instance of a signal passed at danger is thoroughly investigated. Queensland Rail's dedicated Signals Passed At Danger Prevention Task Force formed in October of last year by the Palaszczuk government has already prepared a comprehensive strategy aimed at reducing the signals passed at danger rate.

In February 2018 the task force commenced implementing a broad range of additional safety controls and new initiatives focusing on human factors, driver style, increased levels of engagement and improvements in signals passed at danger awareness. While Queensland Rail saw a slight increase in the rate of signals passed at danger on its network from July 2017 to January 2018, since the implementation of initiatives by the task force from February of this year there has already been a stabilisation of this trend with the SPAD rates decreasing by more than seven per cent from January to June 2018 from 2.53 to 2.35.

Overall, the SPAD rates remain low and have not risen in proportion to the increased train movements and the resulting increase in red signals approached by train drivers, with Queensland Rail currently recording one SPAD for approximately every 24,000 red signals approached. Signals passed at danger instances are an industry wide issue by rail operators all over the world. Dedicated resources have been allocated to the task force to accelerate the implementation of priority SPAD improvement initiatives which have been informed by detailed SPAD investigations, research, benchmarking and industry best practice.

The task force has progressed a number of initiatives, including introducing new toolbox talks and prestart processes with train crew and train control employees, regularly reviewing signalling infrastructure and increased communication with employees regarding SPADs and their prevention. Queensland Rail is also analysing event recorder data from incident free running. This will assist with identifying train handling behaviour that has a known relationship to SPAD causation in an effort to further improve driver training and awareness. Through regular reviews of signalling infrastructure and SPAD data, Queensland Rail recently identified an opportunity to improve the safety of signalling at Normanby through the installation of a permanent yellow signal to be installed at the location to reduce the likelihood of misperceiving the signal track alignment. This work is expected to be completed by October of this year.

The implementation, of course, of the European Train Control System, expected to be completed by financial year 2022, will effectively eliminate the risk of SPADs through automated engineering controls which will ensure that trains stop within the limits of their authority in the event of human error. I do note that there is substantial funding in the budget this year, Mr Chair, for a European Train Control System. We are very committed to it. It is a safer system. It is being funded and, of course, once it is fully implemented we will see this issue largely dealt with.

Mr MINNIKIN: A couple of other quick questions on SPAD please?

CHAIR: Yes.

Mr MINNIKIN: Are you able to confirm that despite the potential for serious accidents, under the deal made with the powerful RTBU drivers can have multiple SPAD events without ever being demoted back to guard?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. Can I say that this is certainly a matter for Queensland Rail to comment on so I might ask the CEO to come up. But there are certainly provisions in relation to the organisation's response to SPAD events.

Mr Easy: Would you mind repeating that question for me?

Mr MINNIKIN: Certainly. It was asked of the minister if he was able to confirm that despite the potential for serious accidents under the deal made with the powerful RTBU drivers can have multiple SPAD events recorded without being demoted back to a guard.

Mr Easy: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am not aware of any deal that you are referring to in relation to that.

CHAIR: Are you referring to the enterprise bargaining agreement?

Mr MINNIKIN: Yes.

Mr Easy: In terms of a SPAD or signal passed at danger, when it does occur we treat those very seriously. Every one of those involves an investigation. The driver is removed from the network. We complete the investigation. There are times when we take disciplinary action in relation to that. It would not be appropriate to be commenting on any individual circumstances, but we take each investigation seriously. We consider the cause of the incident and we consider what controls might be put in place. We also consider what appropriate measures should be taken with respect to the driver. Sometimes that does involve rehabilitation. Sometimes that does involve disciplinary action. But in reference to any pre-agreed arrangement as to how we would manage those matters, that is certainly not to my knowledge.

Mr MINNIKIN: There are incidences or examples, are there not, of drivers who have had more than one SPAD red card incident—so at least two or three or more—who have actually been transferred back to being a guard? I know you cannot comment on individuals but just as a general question.

Mr Easy: I thank the honourable member for the follow-up question. I think if we look at history and over time going back many years there would be examples where there are multiple SPAD events by a single driver. That is certainly not a new occurrence. I think that is something we have seen happen over many years and if we go back through the records that would demonstrate that. I think our approach today is very robust. We take, as I said, each investigation very seriously. We engage with the individual drivers to ensure that we have the best response, which includes the controls, the approach to management of our drivers. We are putting in place many new measures for our drivers in respect to SPADs which comes as a result of the comprehensive risk management strategy we have in place. That includes in-cab engagement, it includes toolbox talks with our train controllers. We have a 10-point prestart process for our drivers prior to them commencing revenue services and we also are going to the lengths of employing a psychologist to provide assistance around the human behavioural aspects of incidents that involve SPADs on our network. We have a very comprehensive approach and we are seeing a reduction in the rolling 12-month average, as has been said, from what was a slight increase to January of 2.53 to now what is 2.35 for the month of January.

Mr MINNIKIN: My last question was to Mr Easy, while he is at the table.

CHAIR: Yes.

Mr MINNIKIN: Can you guarantee commuters that SPADs and failing to stop at stations or simply cancelling a train are not linked to an attempt by Queensland Rail to address poor on-time running and performance metrics?

Mr Easy: I thank the honourable member for the question. I do not think there is any relationship between SPADs and on-time running.

CHAIR: I will just go to the member for Traeger.

Mr KATTER: On page 29 of the SDS, in relation to the port at Karumba, can the minister advise whether the government will ensure a portion of the estimated \$15 million in revenue that will be earned by Ports North through its contract with New Century Mine will be quarantined for future investment? As the minister will be aware, the last time Century had operations Ports North said they had no money left for dredging at the end of the period that the old Century Mine was there. We have New Century Mine now saying they are going to tip \$15 million in. Can you ensure that there will be some money quarantined for ongoing operations beyond the life of that mine so we do not have a recurrence of what happened last time?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. Of course I am very familiar with the port of Karumba. We have worked together on this before when the old mine ceased and there

were silting issues. You made representations to have it dredged and thanks to the government and Ports North that work was done to assist the other non-mineral exporters there. We were very happy to do that.

Of course, with the new mine coming in, which is good news for that whole region and the port, the government is very committed to improving productivity at what is one of our most remote ports, let us be frank, in the gulf to provide an economic boost for local communities. There is a new \$6.8 million dredging program for the port underway due to be completed this month to create a channel depth of 3.2 metres. This investment followed the decision by New Century Resources to recommence shipping operations through Karumba from October this year. This will be a significant contributor to regional growth in the north-west of the state. It has been well received by the local council and by port users who appreciate its importance to the economy of Karumba and the gulf region more broadly. I also acknowledge your ongoing advocacy.

The Minerals and Metals Group, or MMG as everyone calls them, Century Mine ceased mining in 2015 and the last mineral exports from the mine occurred in early 2016. MMG had fully funded the channel dredging. However, funding ceased on the suspension of those operations. There is no business case for Ports North to undertake the annual dredging of the port of Karumba without the establishment of a new bulk cargo operation based on the revenues from the cattle exports.

In 2016 the Palaszczuk government funded \$1.7 million for the dredging to ensure continued security of the cattle trade out of the port. Since that time there has been five cattle shipments there with 8,849 head of cattle shipped out of Karumba. In 2018 Ports North finalised an agreement with New Century Resources, who took over the operations of the MMG facilities both at the port and at the mine, to re-establish transshipping operations through the port of Karumba with operations due to commence in October this year. This agreement provides for the re-establishment of the port's channel and ongoing annual maintenance dredging to be funded by New Century Resources. The dredging campaign has commenced, as I mentioned, at a cost of \$6.8 million and will be completed by July 2018.

Recommencement of export operations by New Century Resources will be a significant contributor to regional growth and has been well received by the local council and port users who appreciate its importance to the economic sustainability of Karumba and the gulf region more broadly. I might just ask the CEO of Ports North to come to the table and comment and cover anything I might not have covered.

Mr Boland: Further to the minister's statement, the dredging has now been completed. The final cost, all fully funded by New Century, was \$7.2 million and the dredging outcome was 3.4 metres draft so it was an improvement on our original targeted depth and a good outcome for the cattle ships and New Century for its ongoing operations.

Mr KATTER: Another issue is maintenance of tourism roads in the north. It has been a growing issue. We have Cobbold Gorge, we have Lawn Hill Gorge. We have tiny little shires trying to keep up. We appreciate the government has had involvement in this space before, but there are some pretty big sections of road now, often surrounded by national park as in the case of Lawn Hill, where these tiny little councils are trying to keep up with, say in the case of Lawn Hill, going from 4,000 visitors a year to 40,000 in the last 15 years. This tiny little council is trying to maintain this road with limited funds. What is the government's strategy to deal with these issues?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. It is a very good one. The Palaszczuk Labor government and I, as the responsible minister, are very keen on this. We have the new Transport and Tourism Connections Program. I was very pleased to be out there for one of the completed projects in Winton. I know that is not in your current electorate but you know that community very well from the previous term. We have just completed the Butch Lenton Way up to the dinosaur centre from the highway. It is the first time it has had an all-weather sealed road and I am pleased to say—I do not think I have had a chance to tell you this—they are getting record numbers through the dinosaur centre—470. They have been smashing their old records by 50, 60 people. The number of grey nomads, people with campervans—they have actually done the car park as well—it was absolutely packed. The day I was there there were very few people and a couple of weeks ago it was absolutely shoulder to shoulder. It is fantastic to see.

015 That is the kind of outcome that we want from the Transport and Tourism Connections program. It is a \$10 million program. By the end of last month we had successfully completed 18 projects. Of course, this is a 50-50 program, so we work with councils to fund roads on a partnership basis and get more bang for our buck. On 27 April 2017 we announced that 18 major tourist and culturally significant

sites in western Queensland were granted a funding injection of almost \$6 million to improve transport and road access.

On 16 May 2018 I announced that the Palaszczuk Labor government will soon be seeking nominations from relevant local governments for round 2 of the program, with around \$4 million in state funding available for priority projects. I certainly encourage any of the councils in the member's electorate to be ready to respond and to submit to that. Round 2 will be extended beyond western Queensland to cover rural and regional Queensland outside of South-East Queensland to maximise the benefits of the funding. Funding for upgrades will be capped at \$500,000 to deliver a wide spread of projects across regional Queensland. This \$10 million program allows the Queensland government to work with local governments and the private sector to upgrade infrastructure to improve access to Queensland's most significant tourism experiences. It is another example of how the Queensland government is delivering for all Queenslanders, no matter where they live in our state.

The landscapes and attractions in western Queensland are fantastic. I always enjoy travelling out there in my ministerial role and talking to local communities. I think it is an area that we can continue to significantly develop in the tourism space. I have had the great pleasure of travelling in a number of Asian countries where there are a lot of people and it is really high density living. There is not always the cleanest air in some of those big cities. They come to Queensland and breathe our clear air and see our landscapes and what we have to offer. We have tremendous opportunities there and I want to see communities in western Queensland benefit.

The program aims to improve access to significant tourism sites with road upgrades. This is a very good case for getting different departments to work together. We are Transport and Main Roads, but this is largely about tourism and economic development. We have been very happy to work with Minister Jones and other ministers to do this. We are all getting benefits out of it. All bid sites have to relate to established tourism attractions on the state controlled and local government controlled road networks. It does not have to be one of our roads to be eligible under this funding; it can be a council road. Potentially, it could happen at Lawn Hill and other locations, which is something for the member to note. We are happy to work with the member and his community. This is a fantastic new program that we have put in place over the past year or so.

Mr KATTER: I want to build on the question from the member for Bundamba about local contractors and the discussion about materials. Probably one of the other issues is competency and labour content, in terms of stimulating local economies. We had the much publicised event at Millaa Millaa recently, and we had an issue in Winton a few years back, when outside contractors did not understand the temperatures at which bitumen should be laid. It is about local knowledge. Can the minister say what the strategies are to deal with that in the future, to meet the criteria for local employment? Obviously there has been a lot of success, but there have been some failures where they have used the wrong people in some places.

Mr BAILEY: We brought in a local procurement policy across government which has been very strong. I think it has been very well received in communities. It increases the ability to wait for local manufacturers and local producers and service providers. We are increasingly going to be seeing local communities benefit from that. Of course, every contract is different, so there are going to be variations there. I will ask my DG to comment on that specifically in a moment.

In relation to the Millaa Millaa road, obviously that situation was entirely unacceptable. I was extremely angry to see that occur. We acted immediately to allow people who were affected to contact us and to submit claims for compensation. Clearly it was unacceptable. As soon as I was aware of that I called my director-general to make my displeasure about the outcome known on behalf of motorists. There is an investigation into that which is ongoing. I will ask my director-general to comment.

Mr Scales: I apologise for the Millaa Millaa road, because it was something that we did not anticipate. As the minister said, he has called for an independent inquiry. The member might be entirely right: it might have been lack of local knowledge on the Tablelands. I do not want to say too much because of the independent investigation.

A lot of the work that we do in the field is done by RoadTek. RoadTek, by definition, are local people. We try to put in as much local content as we can. We now have an imperative through the procurement strategy that the government has just introduced. We are continuing to work with local authorities. The Transport and Infrastructure Development Scheme, TIDS, is really good. I get around to as many roads and regional transport meetings as I can. You have seen me at them and you have been at them as well. It is all about working together and making sure that we get the best results for the people of Queensland.

CHAIR: Minister did you want to add something to that?

Mr BAILEY: No, I think we have answered that one well, but I did want to add a response to the member for Bundamba.

CHAIR: Is this an answer to a question on notice?

Mr BAILEY: It is in relation to the Cherish the Environment Foundation question that the honourable member asked earlier. It is pretty short.

In relation to Cherish the Environment Foundation and the Darra to Springfield offset, the tree planting was part of the Springfield project. I am advised that approximately 22,590 koala-habitat trees were planted at Mutdapilly, south of Ipswich, between March and May 2016. That tree planting was completed in May that year. Queensland Rail has ensured its continued oversight of the project, most recently doing a site inspection in December last year to ensure the maintenance of those trees.

Mr MELLISH: Page 8 of Budget Paper No. 3 refers to the Transport and Infrastructure Development Scheme, TIDS. What impact does that program have in local communities? Can the minister outline any recent projects supported by the government under the program?

Mr BAILEY: I am glad we are talking about TIDS, which the director-general just referenced briefly. It is one of our favourite programs. We understand the importance of funding transport infrastructure in regional Queensland. A key component of that support is the 50-50 scheme with local councils under the Transport and Infrastructure Development Scheme. Under this program, local governments collaborate with my department's districts to form 17 regional roads and transport groups that make local transport infrastructure investment decisions based on regional priorities.

Before the 2015 election, Queensland Labor committed to restoring TIDS to give our regions the local infrastructure they deserve after they had suffered deep cuts to the TIDS program under the previous Newman LNP government. Our 2015 state budget accelerated an increase to TIDS of \$30 million per annum. We exceeded our election commitment. We said we would do it in 2016-17 and we brought it forward a whole year, particularly because a lot of the communities were suffering drought and we wanted to support them. We boosted it to \$70 million. That commitment was extended out to 2021-22 as part of this year's budget.

I certainly remember, in the first month or two of being the Minister for Main Roads, going to local government conferences and hearing the same story from mayors all over the state—many of them very conservative mayors. They said that they were devastated by the cuts to the TIDS program. It meant that they had to lay off workers, often in small regional towns, when they had been led to believe that they would get increased funding. They felt quite betrayed by the previous LNP government. We listened to them, and that is one of the key reasons we brought it forward a year. This is money well spent in regional Queensland, often in small communities where a couple of jobs really makes a difference, including for the profitability and viability of other people in the community as well.

The TIDS commitment is a commitment of \$280 million over four years across the state. That is more than a 90 per cent increase in funding compared to what the LNP committed in its last budget. Our boost to funding for this important partnership with local governments gives councils the certainty they need to plan for the future. The financial sustainability of rural and remote councils, and in some cases whole communities, is highly dependent on the certainty of road and transport program funding, with the roads program forming the bulk of councils' operating expenditure.

The 2016-17 TIDS program delivered 256 projects right across the state. I am proud to say that in the 2017-18 financial year 286 projects were delivered. That was an increase of 30 projects. The Richmond Shire Council on the North West Queensland Regional Roads and Transport Group, in the electorate of Traeger, completed works on Richmond-Croydon Road using \$722,500 worth of TIDS funding. That vital road is an important north-south link between Richmond and Croydon, servicing the beef cattle industry, the farming industry and the tourism sector. The Eastern Downs RRTG used over \$1.3 million in TIDS funding on upgrades to Boundary Street on the western outskirts of Toowoomba. This will benefit the community through linkages to the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing, improving access to heavy vehicles and freight transport, and removing traffic from other adjacent streets.

The Brisbane Metro Alliance RRTG invested over \$522,000 of TIDS funding to upgrade access to eight schools within the Brisbane City Council area, improving the safety of students, parents and members of the community around schools. The Scenic Valleys RRTG invested \$705,446 of TIDS funding to upgrade Old Toowoomba Road in Ipswich from two lanes to four lanes between Ernest Street and Toongarra Road. That project continues into the 2018-19 TIDS program. TIDS includes \$600,000 provided annually as subsidies through the statewide capability development fund to develop the

capability and capacity of RRTGs in, for example, traffic management design, bridge inspections and road safety audits.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander councils also benefited from \$8.2 million in TIDS funding in 2017-18, with investment in the upgrade of transport infrastructure to improve access via road, air and sea to Indigenous and remote communities. For example, the Lockhart Aboriginal Shire Council has installed three culverts on Portland Road using \$1.2 million worth of TIDS funding, greatly benefiting that community by improving both the road's resilience and access after the wet season.

Our TIDS program is absolutely vital to communities such as those I have just listed. The Palaszczuk Labor government is restoring after the damage done by the Newman LNP government when it stripped that funding not just from us but also from local government and many regional communities.

CHAIR: We have one brief question from the member for Bundamba, but I am mindful of the time, as we also have to give the minister an opportunity to get back to the question on notice, which we will talk about after the member's question.

Mrs MILLER: I do not mind if you take this on notice, Minister. I refer to your answer about the trees being ripped out of Springfield and replanted at Mutdapilly. Quite frankly, that is on the way to Boonah and that is ridiculous. Would you consider a change in policy within Queensland Rail, so that the trees that were ripped out of Springfield or the local area are replanted in the same suburb or nearby? It is inexcusable to relocate trees from Springfield at Mutdapilly.

Mr BAILEY: I might have to take that on notice. I expect that the offset was in relation to that specific upgrade.

Mrs MILLER: It was.

Mr BAILEY: I would have to get advice from Minister Enoch as well, because that also covers her department. If you like, I am happy to look into it a bit further.

Mrs MILLER: Yes, please. Can you also address the other part of the question, which was that QR gave the money to the wrong organisation? Cherish the Environment Foundation is a charity foundation; it is not a trust fund, which I understand is where the money should have gone.

Mr BAILEY: I am certainly happy to come back to you on that.

CHAIR: The only other question on notice you said you would refer to Minister Enoch. It was the question about transshipping from the member for Traeger.

Mr BAILEY: Do you require that by the end of this hearing?

CHAIR: No. I think you were referring it to Minister Enoch. I am clarifying that that was the answer?

Mr BAILEY: That is correct.

CHAIR: The time allocated for the consideration of the estimates of expenditure in the portfolio areas of Transport and Main Roads has now expired. The questions taken on notice you have resolved to answer and provide to the committee secretariat by 3 pm on Tuesday, 31 July.

Mr BAILEY: Certainly.

CHAIR: You can check the exact wording of any outstanding questions in the proof transcript of this session of the hearing, which will be available on the Hansard page of the parliament's website within approximately two hours. Thank you, Minister and departmental officers, for your attendance. Minister, you may take a moment to thank your staff, if you wish.

Mr BAILEY: I would love to. I thank you, Chair. I take this opportunity to thank those who appeared at the hearing today: the Director-General of Transport and Main Roads, Neil Scales; the CEO of Queensland Rail, Nick Easy; the CEO of Far North Queensland Ports Corporation, Chris Boland; the CEO of Port of Townsville Corporation, Raneé Crosby; and the Gladstone Ports Corporation also has a range of officers present. Thank you all for attending. Additional thanks go to those who were not called upon but who were well prepared for today, I am sure. To all the staff in the department and the authorities who worked incredibly hard behind the scenes to prepare for these hearings: your work does not go unnoticed. I certainly place on the record my appreciation as the minister for all the work that you put in. I take the opportunity to thank my ministerial staff, led my chief of staff on my left, for all the work that they put in to get me ready for this. Ministerial staff work incredibly hard. I thank all of my team for doing really fantastic work. Finally, thank you to the committee and to the guests. Thank you for the opportunity to answer your questions here today.

CHAIR: Thank you very much, Minister. The committee will adjourn for a break. The hearing will resume at 2.15 pm with the examination of the estimates of the portfolios of the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport.

Proceedings suspended from 1.16 pm to 2.15 pm.

ESTIMATES—TRANSPORT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE—HOUSING AND PUBLIC WORKS, DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY AND SPORT

In Attendance

Hon. MC de Brenni, Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport

Ms H Spencer, Chief of Staff

Department of Housing and Public Works

Ms L Carroll, Director-General

Ms R Turbit, Assistant Director-General, Corporate Services

Queensland Building and Construction Commission

Mr B Bassett, Commissioner

Stadiums Queensland

Mr T Harris, Chief Executive

016



CHAIR: The committee will now examine the proposed expenditure in the Appropriation Bill 2018 for the portfolio areas of the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport. On behalf of the committee, I welcome the minister, the director-general, departmental officers and members of the public to the hearing. The committee will examine the minister's portfolio until 6.30 pm and will suspend proceedings for a break between 4.15 and 4.45 pm. I welcome the visiting members present: Mr Michael Hart MP, the member for the Burleigh; and Mr John-Paul Langbroek MP, the member for Surfers Paradise.

I remind those present this afternoon that the committee's proceedings are proceedings of the Queensland parliament and are subject to the standing rules and orders of the parliament. It is important that questions and answers remain relevant and succinct. The same rules for questions that apply in parliament also apply in this hearing. I refer to standing orders 112 and 115 in this regard. Questions should be brief and relate to one issue and should not contain lengthy or subjective preambles, argument or opinion.

I intend to guide proceedings today so that relevant issues can be explored fully without imposing artificial time limits and to ensure there is adequate opportunity to address questions from government and non-government members of the committee and non-committee members. For the benefit of Hansard, I ask departmental officers to identify themselves the first time they answer a question referred to them by the minister or director-general.

I now declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio areas of Housing and Public Works, Digital Technology and Sport open for examination. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

Minister, if you wish you make an opening statement of no more than five minutes.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you very much, Chair. Good afternoon committee members and other members and guests. Let me begin by acknowledging the traditional owners of the land on which we gather this afternoon and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging.

The 2018-19 budget establishes the next year to be one of achievements and one of growth for the Department of Housing and Public Works, building on our past success. The machinery of government changes earlier this year brought digital technology and sport and recreation services into the Department of Housing and Public Works. Bringing these functions together sets new challenges as well as provides great opportunities to serve the people of Queensland in an agile and responsive way.

I am immensely proud that our Premier, in this budget, has recommenced the Building and Asset Services Apprenticeship Program. The program offers direct employment and trade training to young Queenslanders across the state. The Palaszczuk cabinet also approved the department to commence construction of a further 599 new social and affordable homes through our record Housing Construction Jobs Program.

Our Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Act has introduced reforms to Queensland's building and construction industry not seen in a generation. Project bank accounts were introduced on government projects from 1 March this year. I can advise that the steady rollout of those reforms is continuing, with the second phase of those reforms due for implementation on 17 December this year.

The Palaszczuk government's non-conforming building products chain of responsibility legislation has provided our state's industry regulator with new powers to seek out and deal with non-conforming building products all the way up the supply chain. Queensland's response to the issue of non-conforming building products, particularly cladding, is at the forefront of international efforts. Queensland is not just leading the nation in this regard; we are leading the globe.

I would like to place on record my thanks to the Hon. Terry Mackenroth for leading our Non-Conforming Building Products Audit Taskforce. I especially want to thank Terry's family, particularly his wife, Mary, for the time that Terry spent with the task force, even through his final days. Funds committed in the 2018-19 budget will support the implementation of his task force recommendations in both the Department of Housing and Public Works and in the Queensland Building and Construction Commission.

This government has been reformist in just about every sphere of government policy that you could think of. In addressing climate change we have taken leadership. QFleet has commenced its transition to a carbon neutral vehicle fleet with the go live of our QFleet environmental strategy and our QFleet electric vehicle transition strategy. The budget again shows a healthy position for QFleet this coming year.

Our department is helping to connect Queenslanders through our Advance Queensland Community Digital Champions program, which has reached more than 130,000 Queenslanders so far. Development of our overarching sports and active recreation strategy—the first this state has ever seen—is well underway. Early work has focused on our state's major sporting assets—our Stadiums Queensland venues. These assets were built by Queenslanders, they belong to Queenslanders and we want to make sure that they work for all Queenslanders.

I understand a review was undertaken by the previous LNP government and it took no action in response to the findings of that review. In contrast, John Lee and his stadiums task force have done excellent work to examine the management and hiring models utilised by Stadiums Queensland and they have presented a number of recommendations to government, all of which we support or support in principle.

This year we will commit record funding to sports and recreation. Our sports and active recreation strategy will be about addressing inequality of all kinds. It is about supporting Queenslanders to achieve and maintain a healthy weight. Most of all, it is about giving all Queenslanders an opportunity to be a part of a supported and connected community. I am pleased to announce today that public consultation on our strategy will open tomorrow. My department will host a series of roadshows around the state so that Queenslanders can have their say.

In closing, I would like to thank the staff of the Department of Housing and Public Works for their continued efforts to serve the people of Queensland. I would especially like to acknowledge the director-general, Liza Carroll, who has overseen some incredible organisational change over the past year. I would also like to thank our boards, the members of my ministerial housing council and the ministerial construction council for their advice and assistance over the past 12 months. I also welcome the members of the sports minister's advisory council and thank them for their commitment in helping to make this great state even better.

CHAIR: I now call the member for Surfers Paradise.

Mr LANGBROEK: I welcome the minister, director-general, departmental staff and ministerial staff. I thank the committee for having me as a guest at today's hearing. My first question is to the director-general. Recently the Premier announced that a grandstand at Suncorp was going to be named after Terry Mackenroth. The minister has acknowledged his tragic passing recently. Director-general, could you advise the committee when you were first made aware of the decision to rename the grandstand after Mr Mackenroth, which was first reported in the *Courier-Mail* on Wednesday, 4 July?

Ms Carroll: I do not have to hand the exact date of the first time I heard about it. Certainly there was some discussion with the minister about what would be appropriate recognition for Mr Mackenroth. The conversations from there would have happened with Stadiums Queensland and their board.

Mr LANGBROEK: Could you expand a little on how you were informed about this? I presume it was the Premier's call? It was a captain's call as I understand it.

Mr de BRENNI: First of all, I reject the assertion and characterisation of the decision that was taken as a captain's call. I would also like to remind the member for Surfers Paradise of the remarks that have been reported in the media about the anguish that the family has felt in respect of this issue already. I question the appropriateness of bringing up the matter in this way and extending the anguish even further.

CHAIR: Minister, I was just going to ask the member how this relates to the appropriations. I was just seeing where we were going with it.

Mr LANGBROEK: It is about the operation of the state's premier sporting facilities at page 12 of the SDS. It is about the fact that there were obviously costs associated with such signage. I am going to explore that. I understand the concerns that Mrs Mackenroth and members of the Mackenroth family may have had.

CHAIR: We will let the minister answer.

Mr de BRENNI: I will keep it succinct to minimise the extension of the ventilation of this matter in such a manner. I discussed the issue with the Premier ahead the Hon. Terry Mackenroth's funeral. The idea was discussed directly with his wife. I wrote to the Stadiums Queensland board about the proposal. It is Stadiums Queensland that is responsible for Suncorp Stadium. I wrote to them on 18 June. The board responded approving the request and confirming they had spoken with the relevant hirers who had expressed support for the proposition. I want to be clear on that. That correspondence was received in my office on 29 June 2018. Accordingly, I informed the Premier in writing of the decision by Stadiums Queensland and the hirers to support the proposition. I did that on 2 July 2018. The Premier announced the stand naming on 3 July 2018.

There was a small cost to produce the signage—\$13,600. I am reliably informed by Stadiums Queensland that the sign is such that the letters appearing on it can be changed or varied. There is no waste in the production of the sign as it will be able to be used in other locations. I sincerely hope that this concludes the extended run of political mileage made of the death of a great Queenslanders.

Mr LANGBROEK: My next question is to the director-general. Could you advise the committee whether any of the other stands at Suncorp are named after an individual?

Ms Carroll: I am not specifically aware of the naming of other stands. As I have previously indicated, the Stadiums Queensland board and the Stadiums Queensland entity are responsible for the management of the stadiums, including Suncorp.

Mr LANGBROEK: The minister has just advised the committee that the signage cost \$13,600. Could you advise us how big the sign is? The Premier had said that it was one small panel. We understand that it was 12 metres long. I am happy for either of you to give the committee the information.

Mr de BRENNI: I do not have to hand the details of the sign in terms of its square metreage. I will go to the question that the member for Surfers Paradise asked about whether other grandstands have been named. The member for Surfers Paradise would be aware that the stand was previously named the Ron McAuliffe stand.

Mr LANGBROEK: At Lang Park.

Mr de BRENNI: It is in the same location. Your contention that stands have not been named in politicians' honour—

Mr LANGBROEK: I have not contended anything. I was just asking.

CHAIR: Please allow the minister to answer the question.

Mr de BRENNI: I am happy to ask the CEO of Stadiums Queensland to provide me with the square metreage and dimensions of the sign if it is of benefit to the committee. Clearly you think it is of benefit that Queenslanders know this. I fail to see how. I will endeavour to provide that information before the committee hearing concludes.

Mr LANGBROEK: I appreciate that. Can you expand a little more on the sign itself? You mentioned that it cost \$13,600. Is it interchangeable? Is it like a Lego sign? Can you explain whether the sign has been painted? I think it is a perfectly fair question. Is it that it could be used somewhere else?

CHAIR: Minister, I will give you the opportunity to answer. The minister is not an engineer. If he does have some information on that—

Mr LANGBROEK: He told the committee—

CHAIR: Yes, he did.

Mr LANGBROEK: I am interested in the information, Chair.

CHAIR: Maybe you are an engineer—sorry, Minister.

Mr de BRENNI: I am not an engineer. The committee's proceedings, member for Surfers Paradise, are not a joke; nor is the passing of a former member of this House and a deputy premier of this state. That is the approach that is being taken here. What I can confirm to the committee is that the sign would have been a fitting honour of his contribution to Queensland. It has not proceeded. As far as I think all Queenslanders are concerned, that should bring closure to the matter.

Mr LANGBROEK: Minister, with the greatest respect, I am not questioning any of those aspects that you have mentioned about the passing of Terry Mackenroth, who was in the parliament when I came here, but it was you who advised this committee that the sign, which is now somewhere in storage, I presume, is able to be re-used and, I presume, in its current form, which must have had—

CHAIR: Member, is there a question?

Mr LANGBROEK: I am just asking for clarification. There is no reflection on the family. I just want to know about a sign that can supposedly be prepared but now is somewhere else.

CHAIR: Member, is there a question?

Mr LANGBROEK: Yes. I am asking for the minister to clarify about this sign—

CHAIR: The minister said he will try to get back with that information.

Mr LANGBROEK: He is coming back with signage size—

CHAIR: Dimensions.

Mr LANGBROEK:—dimensions and also details about how it is somehow able to be used in some other form?

CHAIR: Do you have another question?

Mr LANGBROEK: Director-General, can you advise us about the scaffolding? We understand that scaffolding was put in place to erect the sign. Could you confirm whether that is correct and what the cost was of that scaffolding contract?

Mr de BRENNI: I think the best way to respond to the member for Surfers Paradise's bizarre and morbid line of questioning would be to invite the CEO of Stadiums Queensland to answer questions in relation to the operations of the proposed sign. I am going to invite the CEO, Todd Harris, to the table. Todd might have with him an indication of the dimensions, the material and the scaffolding. Yes, there was a small cost incurred in relation to the erection of scaffolding. I am sure that Todd can elaborate on that for the benefit of the committee, if you could call it that.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Harris, I welcome your contribution.

Mr Harris: In relation to the dimensions of the sign, the letters are approximately 600 millimetres in height to fit in the space which is on the third tier of the eastern grandstand which is a 700-millimetre dimension. There is existing sail track that sits on that track that holds other signage. The span is 12 metres in length for the sign. They are individual letters that would have been attached to that grandstand. In terms of the cost of scaffolding—

Mr de BRENNI: I raise a point of order, Chair. The member for Callide is wheeling out a tape measure.

CHAIR: I did not see that. Is that a prop you have there?

Mr de BRENNI: It is a prop. Not only is it a prop; this is a disgusting display—

CHAIR: Member for Callide, that is inappropriate. Can you please put that away? Thank you for bringing that to my attention.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Chair, may the record reflect the disgusting behaviour that is being shown by the members of the opposition in relation to this matter. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

CHAIR: Thank you, Minister. Mr Harris, would you like to continue?

Mr Harris: The cost for the scaffolding was \$2,500. The total cost for the sign inclusive of that scaffolding cost was \$13,600. The signage costs were obviously excluding that \$2,500 for scaffolding.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Harris, if I may continue to ask you a question, the signage was to be located in an area that, as you have already mentioned, was previously reserved for corporate sponsorship. Can you advise the committee what the forgone annual revenue is from that positioning?

Mr Harris: In terms of lost revenue?

Mr LANGBROEK: Yes, the lost revenue from where the sign was going to be.

Mr Harris: There was no lost revenue at all. After the request was made, we consulted with each of the hirers of Suncorp Stadium—all the anchor tenants and also the tenants that come on a one-off basis such as the ARU for a Wallabies match. At either end of the grandstand on the eastern side there is 25 metres of signage span that is taken up by no-smoking signs and stadium assist signage. The discussions that we had with the hirers were to relocate the 12 metres of signage that was theirs for their specific event into the 25-metre signage. We actually offered them more span or length for their signage to be installed at either ends of the eastern grandstand. There was zero cost impact as a result of that and no loss of revenue to the stadium or to the hirers as a result of that.

Mr LANGBROEK: Can you advise us where the sign is now, Mr Harris, and what is planned for it?

Mr MELLISH: I raise a point of order, Chair, under tedious repetition. This has already been answered.

CHAIR: Yes. Do you have another line of questioning?

Mr LANGBROEK: I was not sure that we had had that answered, Chair, about where the sign is now.

CHAIR: I believe it was stated that it was in storage. Does it matter exactly where it is?

Mr LANGBROEK: We are just getting the details for the committee, Chair.

CHAIR: Do you have a simple answer to that, please?

Mr Harris: It is in storage with the signage contractor. It will be relocated to one of our venues for storage so we do not keep it within his premises.

CHAIR: Can we move on now?

Mr LANGBROEK: Yes, certainly. With reference to the Budget Measures, Budget Paper No. 4, page 58 refers to an allocation for local sporting infrastructure of \$15 million. It is not allocated in any particular year. It says, 'The Government is providing additional funding of \$15 million ... to support the development of local sporting infrastructure.' Would you advise the committee what that is specifically for, if possible?

Mr de BRENNI: The member for Surfers Paradise would be very familiar with the proposal to construct facilities in the Ipswich local government area so that we can support the expansion of women sport in particular. Members of the committee and all Queenslanders would be very familiar with the success and the significant growth of women players in non-traditional sports such as AFL. The Brisbane women's Lions making the grand final in their first season brought impetus to the discussions around a proposal brought by the AFL for the construction of a complex in the Ipswich area.

The intent of our government which we have clearly expressed to the AFL is that, should the federal government be willing to make a commitment to the project, then we would allocate those funds to that project. We made that very clear. I also made it very clear to the Commonwealth that we had funds earmarked at the ready. We have done so for a very long time. I think it is worth pointing out for the record that, despite numerous promises made by the Commonwealth, they have committed no funds to support women sport in Queensland or towards that project.

Mr LANGBROEK: Minister, does that mean, then, that there is no prospect of any other local sporting infrastructure being provided under this particular amount of funding? The \$15 million is really just for Springfield, as I understand it?

Mr de BRENNI: We will make a decision based on that depending on whether or not the Commonwealth decides to support women sport in Queensland, and to date it has not. I urge you to contact the federal sports minister and ask the federal minister to make a decision that supports sport in Queensland.

I point out for the benefit of the committee that over the 2018-19 budget period the Queensland government is committing \$124 million to support local sporting infrastructure right across this state. The member's own electorate of Surfers Paradise is a beneficiary of that with the Female Facilities Program. As soon as there is clarity from the Commonwealth about whether it intends to support projects like this one, we will make a decision around the allocation of those funds. I will point out that on many occasions the Commonwealth has indicated publicly that it intended to support this but it has been unable to provide formal advice in that regard.

Mr LANGBROEK: I refer to page 12 of the SDS in relation to 'developing and delivering a suite of funding programs to support community sport and active recreation needs'. The Sunshine Coast Marathon has had departmental funding for a number of years and that money has now been cut. Can you explain to the committee why this funding has been cut?

Mr de BRENNI: I can explain to the committee about the reallocation of funds in the Sunshine Coast area. In 2016-17 and in 2017-18, it was made clear to the private sector operators of that festival that the department's sponsorship guidelines did not allow for sponsorship to exceed beyond three years. In the case of the marathon, it was well beyond that. On two occasions I have written to the organisers of that event and indicated to them that, given that the event was well established—because that is what sponsorship is for: to establish new events that attract new participants to sport—and given that it had attracted very significant commercial and corporate sponsorship, the event could stand on its own two feet.

In addition to that, if the event felt that it was a significant source of tourism revenue to the Sunshine Coast area, the appropriate source of funding to support events like that should be sought from Tourism and Events Queensland. We have made that very clear. I also made it clear to the organisers, and I have made it clear to relevant stakeholders who have contacted us in regard to this, that the funds that had traditionally, outside of the government's policy, been allocated to the Sunshine Coast Marathon would be better allocated to grassroots athletics on the Sunshine Coast.

Let me be clear, member for Surfers Paradise: there is no cut to sports funding on the Sunshine Coast. However, we are not inclined to continue to provide taxpayer funds towards an event that clearly now has its own operating capacity and significant commercial and corporate sponsorship in the circumstances where grassroots athletics clubs like Little Athletics in the region are crying out for more funding. We simply made it very clear that that funding will be directed towards those grassroots clubs that are supporting people, juniors in particular, getting involved in things like marathon running or other forms of athletics in that region.

CHAIR: You have time for one more question.

Mr LANGBROEK: Again, could you expand on that? As I understand it, the organising committee or the company is a not-for-profit. I know that you mentioned the significant sponsorship they have had. They distribute any revenue they make over and above the costs to local organisations. I think that is their concern—that they are not a commercial entity in that sense. That is why they are perplexed that after seven years the funding has stopped. Are you suggesting that they should change their company structure to potentially get sponsorship again?

CHAIR: I think the minister has answered that. Is there anything you wish to add, Minister?

Mr de BRENNI: I do not seek to intervene in the organisation's company structure. They are a commercial entity. They make those decisions of their own volition. I stress, however, that direct support for athletics on the Sunshine Coast, we feel, is the most appropriate way to encourage more Queenslanders to get involved in sport and recreation.

CHAIR: We now move to the member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: With reference to page 9 of the SDS, will the minister provide an update on the rollout of phase 1 of project bank accounts?

Mr de BRENNI: It is a pleasure to be able to report on the implementation of project bank accounts. As I mentioned in my opening address, project bank accounts address what is a generations old and significant power imbalance that has existed in the construction industry in Queensland but also in other jurisdictions due to the hierarchical nature of contractual terms in the industry. History shows us that the arrangements to date have left subcontractors not only vulnerable to the consequences of late payment but also very vulnerable in cases of insolvencies for parties who are higher up the contractual chain.

018 The Palaszczuk government introduced project bank accounts, and they were designed to restore the balance in the construction industry and ensure that subcontractors get paid in full on time every time. Committee members will recall the passing by the House of the Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Act 2017, the BIF act, and its commencement on 10 November 2017. The BIF act introduced the framework for project bank accounts for government and private sector building and construction projects.

One of the most important things about a PBA is that, in the event of a head contractor insolvency, money in the project bank account is protected for the interests of those subcontractors. That means that progress payments in the project bank account are protected. Importantly, retention moneys held

within project bank accounts are protected and disputed funds, also held in project bank accounts, are protected.

Project bank accounts commenced on 1 March 2018 in respect of government contracts valued between \$1 million and \$10 million inclusive of GST. The first building contract with a requirement to have a project bank account operating on it was awarded on 25 May this year. I can inform the committee that was for the replacement of the Richmond fire and rescue station, and that was awarded on 4 June. Contracts have also been awarded for government employee housing for teachers and health employees on Palm Island; for the construction of social housing under the \$1.6 billion Housing Construction Jobs Program in Nudgee, Clayfield and Southport; a new fire station, as I mentioned, in Richmond; refurbishment of three buildings in the government precinct in Rockhampton; and the construction of new classroom buildings at Chancellor State College and Meridan State College on the Sunshine Coast, Wynnum State High School and Varsity College.

A total of 35 tenders have been called requiring project bank accounts. Twenty government projects requiring project bank accounts have now been awarded and 14 tenders are currently leased, with 11 of those under assessment. Eleven projects have established project bank accounts. They are open and operational as we speak. Pleasingly, two progress payments have already been made through a project bank account. We expect an additional 30 projects to go to tender by the end of September 2018. What this demonstrates is that the implementation of that program is working. It shows that we are reversing the damage caused by the implementation of an observed reporting scheme for building companies as introduced by the previous LNP government. We saw laws change so that licensed contractors did not have to provide financial information showing they complied with financial obligations when they renewed their licence. It made it easier for dodgy operators to do the wrong thing. The building industry fairness act is restoring balance to the industry, and it will make sure that subcontractors get paid in full on time every time.

Mrs MILLER: My question is in relation to the AFL sports complex at Springfield. Considering the proposed actions of the state government in relation to the future of Ipswich City Council, matters currently before the courts generally and reports by the ABC—which I will table now—in relation to the development applications for this project, the community wants certainty in relation to this project. They have asked me to ask you: does the department intend to review the entire project as there appears to be a black cloud over these dodgy development approvals?

CHAIR: We might wait until the minister gets a copy. It is an ABC news report, Minister, and it is two pages.

Mr de BRENNI: Can I take a moment to familiarise myself with the document? Thank you for the question, member for Bundamba. It is important that we take seriously our responsibility when we are investing taxpayers' money into any project. The article that has been tabled refers to the \$60 million stadium and sports complex stalling, mired in controversy and financial difficulties. The only financial difficulty that it has faced to date has been an inability of the Commonwealth government to make a firm commitment in relation to that.

I am very confident that, in all cases where we invest in sporting infrastructure, the department takes matters of due diligence extraordinarily seriously. We would apply that same level of caution and due diligence to investment in this particular project. I know that all other projects that we invest in are carefully managed to ensure that the grant deeds are watertight and that the obligations are met. If there is information that supports the department in the exercise of its due diligence in respect of making grants for this project or for any other project, then we would certainly welcome it. I know that the department would fully consider its implications.

Mrs MILLER: Minister, there are no aspersions in relation to you or the department. This is about the dodgy development approvals in the first place. Given that development applications were made, then they were withdrawn, the land was given to the council and the next day it was approved, what the community is asking me is: because of that dodginess in the first place, is there any issue in relation to the future of this particular project? Bear in mind that Ipswich has been the lightning rod for alleged corruption in Queensland.

Mr de BRENNI: I certainly hope for the benefit of the residents of Ipswich that you represent, member for Bundamba, the fans of AFL—

Mrs MILLER: There are not too many of them in Ipswich, by the way.

Mr de BRENNI: There may very well be after the construction of the stadium. In fact, I was presented with the images from the competition that has been opened by the Lions for the architectural

work. A number of architectural firms have submitted design drawings for this which look quite impressive, and I am sure when the project comes to fruition that it will generate more support.

I do hope for the benefit of the construction workers who will be employed on this project and the ongoing employment—that is another important factor: the ongoing employment that is proposed at that site—that the project is able to succeed. I will take it upon myself to ensure that a high level of scrutiny is undertaken so that the interests of Queensland taxpayers are fully protected. I will engage with my colleagues who hold other portfolios in relation to planning applications and development applications to ensure that the interests of Queenslanders are properly protected and that in the long term we see a facility and an outcome that gets real value for the people of Ipswich.

Mrs MILLER: I have another question in relation to the manufactured homes act and amendments and the proclamation dates. I would like to table many, many letters that I have in relation to that. Minister, I know there is a lot of money that gets spent in relation to the legislation and also amending it, but the constituents have asked me why it has taken so long to bring this legislation online. How many officers are working on the project and how much is it costing Queenslanders? Their main issue is that they want it brought online earlier and they are asking whether that can be done.

CHAIR: Did you wish to table all these copies?

Mrs MILLER: Yes. They are not copies.

CHAIR: No, I see they are individual—

Mrs MILLER: Yes, they have asked me to.

CHAIR: For us to table them we have to copy all of those.

Mrs MILLER: Yes. It is only a photocopier, Mr Chair.

Mr de BRENNI: It is an excellent question. I think the heart of the question goes to the commentary that we have heard from residents in manufactured home parks and retirement villages but more so manufactured home parks. Typically they are Queenslanders with a modest income who are keen to see improvements to their rights. We announced with the Housing Strategy in 2017 in last year's budget that we would make a series of reforms that have been long overdue in respect of manufactured home parks. We passed the reforms in October last year and they received assent in November.

I want to update the committee in respect of what has been implemented, what is coming up and then what is planned for the future. On 10 November 2017 reforms to the manufactured homes act and the Retirement Villages Act 1999 required enforceable behavioural standards in retirement villages and residential parks, which was really quite important, and it dealt with the payment of exit entitlements to former residents of retirement villages after 18 months. That was the first percentage that came in.

What we expect to see implemented by October 2018 are further changes. In respect of retirement villages, we will see improved unit reinstatement and precontractual disclosure arrangements in retirement villages. In manufactured homes, residents are keen to see in place improved dispute resolution procedures that give them real rights to sit at the table as equals with owners of manufactured home parks and settle disputes in relation to the area that they call home. In October those changes will occur. In terms of residential services—what we would generally describe as boarding houses as well—all amendments including notifying the department when somebody passes away in a residential service will be implemented by October.

What we agreed last year with the Ministerial Housing Council, which had representation from residents of manufactured homes, was that we would implement a planned and ordered reform strategy that would be complemented by ongoing consultation but which would also invest in ensuring that residents of manufactured home parks properly understood how to exercise those rights. We have been investing in that through support from Tenants Queensland and working with peak organisations to ensure that when these rights are turned on in October they will be properly enforced by manufactured home park residents.

By June 2019 we will see more standardised retirement village contracts. In 2017 there was an exposé brought by the ABC into the retirement village rip-off that was occurring where 300- and 400-page contracts were being handed to prospective retirement village tenants with high-pressure sales tactics. The introduction of standardised retirement village contracts will come in by June 2019, as will improved precontractual disclosure in residential parks. Again, high-pressure sales tactics in those manufactured home parks have led to individuals investing life savings in those home parks to

find hidden fees, a range of hidden charges and changes to rent being out of their control. There will be standard financial reporting for budgets in those settings as well.

There will be an orderly and methodical approach to the implementation of those changes. I do appreciate that many of those residents wanted to see this five, 10 and 15 years ago. I can assure them by the middle of next year we will see those reforms operational on their sites. The Department of Housing and Public Works through our Residential Services Unit, with the support of organisations like Tenants Queensland, the Manufactured Homes Owners Association and the retirement villages association, will ensure that the residents and owners of those properties are getting a fair go.

019 CHAIR: Minister, with reference to page 35 of the Department of Housing and Public Works SDS, could you please outline the progress of the review of the minimum financial requirements policy and the restructure of the financial investigations unit of the QBCC?

Mr de BRENNI: I appreciate the question. I have already made a remark in relation to previous governments watering down the minimum financial requirements. I indicated that the effect of those changes was that licensed contractors no longer had to provide financial information showing they complied with financial requirements when they renewed their licence. That was a significant change. There was also the removal of the requirement for larger licensed contractors to submit audited financial statements each year. The net effect of those changes made it easy for dodgy operators to do the wrong thing and in effect hide their true financial position. The Building and Construction Commission, because of those changes, was blind to the real financial status of large contractors and licensees in Queensland.

The Palaszczuk government was elected in 2015 with a commitment to investigate the issue of security of payment, and we have delivered in that space. Strong financial requirements for licensees are key to achieving that. The building industry fairness act, as I mentioned, commenced in November 2017. Amongst other matters in those reforms passed in the House, the legislation amends the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act so that the financial requirements to hold a contractor's licence will now be prescribed by a regulation. It is no longer in a policy of the board of the commission; they will now be prescribed by a regulation that is publicly available. The people of Queensland can hold the government to account on that, as can the parliament. That puts the responsibility for making those important decisions where it should be. Important decisions about how we monitor and maintain the financial security of the building and construction industry should rest with government and they should rest with the parliament.

Members of the parliament will have an opportunity to show their commitment to hardworking licensees when we bring on those new regulations. The regulations will be designed to prevent companies from playing what can only be described as fast and loose with other people's money. We will not tolerate cowboys unfettered in the construction industry. At the same time, these requirements will help guide those honest Queensland companies to continue their tremendous work and maintain professional business practices. I was privileged to be at a function last night celebrating the success of one of the Queensland icons in the construction industry, Hutchinson. I previously announced that we want to see businesses like that one that employs Queenslanders and meets those financial obligations go from strength to strength.

I have previously announced I will be releasing a discussion paper shortly for industry consultation around the minimum financial requirements. The changes we propose will introduce targeted annual reporting requirements to replace the current self-reporting mechanism. It will focus on the financial securities which are accepted to ensure they are truly appropriate, so there will be no more relying on the racehorse or the jet ski as an asset. We will give particular attention to related entity loans when a licence holder asks Queensland home builders to put the future of their family business into the licensee's hands. The industry deserves to know that other contractors in the construction chain are not propped up by some dodgy loan that is not real and cannot be called upon.

We will strengthen the definitions and the requirements for the calculation of those assets to ensure there is real clarity. The QBCC will be responsible for checking licence compliance under the minimum financial requirements arrangements. I look forward to consultation with the industry about the proposed regulation for minimum financial requirements.

The leadership at the QBCC, under the new commissioner, will complement the new regulation through risk based reviews of licence compliance through the establishment of a dedicated unit which undertakes proactive reviews of licences. They focus in at those that are deemed to be a risk in the industry and undertake audits of licensees considered to be high risk of noncompliance.

I want to conclude by mentioning the dividends that that approach is paying in the industry. In the 2017-18 financial year, the risk based audit program reviewed 192 licensees and found 176 were not compliant with their financial requirements. That is over 90 per cent audited high-risk licensees located and required to take action to achieve compliance or face being removed by the industry. It shows that the resourced targeting is working. It shows an efficient and effective use of licensees' funds to ensure that the right entities in the industry are held to account. I congratulate the commission on its progress.

CHAIR: We will now go back to the member for Surfers Paradise for a few more questions.

Mr LANGBROEK: Minister, my next question is about the previous Stadiums Queensland board. Could you confirm for the committee that their terms expired on 30 June 2018?

Mr de BRENNI: They did.

Mr LANGBROEK: So they were not sacked; their term simply expired?

Mr de BRENNI: The Premier made it clear I think on 15 April 2018 that the government had made a decision to refresh the board. I reflect on the decision that she announced during an interview. It was my task as the minister responsible to ensure that that occurred and that the refresh of the board did occur. I want to make two remarks. First of all, I want to thank the outgoing members for their contribution to Queensland and in particular welcome the new members of the board who have commenced and held their first meeting earlier this week. I want to congratulate and thank the outgoing chair, Sophie Devitt, for her willingness to support an orderly transition from one team to a new team by staying on with the new team until I think late September. As the committee is aware, Stadiums Queensland faces an important period with the stadiums task force handing to government its interim report and the government responding and adopting all of those recommendations. I have written to that new board and made it very clear to them that a key expectation of government is that they move quickly to implement all of those adopted recommendations.

Mr LANGBROEK: Minister, can you confirm that five of the seven previous board members were appointed by the Palaszczuk government?

Mr de BRENNI: Five of the previous—

Mr LANGBROEK: The ones whose terms expired on 30 June?

Mr de BRENNI: I do not have to hand the appointment processes undertaken by my predecessors so I cannot answer that question.

Mr LANGBROEK: Could you take that on notice, please, Minister?

Mr de BRENNI: I do not see how the appointment of individuals that was outside the budget period we are considering has any bearing on this period. It would not be appropriate for me to start a convention where we entertain exploration of decisions made by cabinets three and four years ago so no, member for Surfers Paradise.

Mr LANGBROEK: That is fine. Minister, can you then advise us about the appointment process for the members of the new board?

Mr de BRENNI: The appointment of all boards in Queensland is that the minister makes a recommendation to cabinet, the cabinet makes a decision if they adopt that recommendation and then it is a matter for the Governor to approve that recommendation.

Mr LANGBROEK: Can you advise how many of the current board have experience in sporting infrastructure or managing commercial venues?

Mr de BRENNI: I can. All of them have experience in either sport or managing commercial ventures.

Mr LANGBROEK: I turn now to the State Netball Centre. The SDS reference is page 12, 'managing purpose-built sport and active recreation facilities'. In August 2016, a question on notice was asked about when the State Netball Centre would be completed and we were advised it would be July 2018. Last year in this committee—and you were not the minister and I was not the shadow—the minister said that the project would be completed in late 2018. Could you give the committee an idea of when the venue will be complete? I notice you have given us an answer to a question on notice, but could you advise us when it will be complete and fully operational?

CHAIR: There was a question on notice on that, which you did mention.

Mr LANGBROEK: Yes, I know.

CHAIR: Is there anything you wish to add to that, Minister?

Mr de BRENNI: I will. I will defer to the question on notice that was responded to. I am very confident that the great new Queensland State Netball Centre in the electorate of Toohey will be open in time for the 2019 Suncorp Super Netball season. I acknowledge that prior to this year there were expansions to the project scope that were funded by previous budgets which obviously changed the date of delivery. I have been out there and visited the site. I have been to the site with the construction firm and the Minister for State Development. Obviously, as the Minister for Sport, I have a keen interest in ensuring that the facility is up and running. I know that the Queensland Firebirds are very keen to ensure that it is open. The Firebirds first played in Brisbane 21 years ago, so it is wonderful to see that they now have a dedicated stadium for their game. In terms of its operational date and its occupation date, I expect it to be in the terms as set out in the answer to the question.

Mr LANGBROEK: Can you clarify for the committee how much this project will cost overall?

Mr de BRENNI: I can. The contract as you know was awarded in February 2017. The funding for the overall project for the Queensland State Netball Centre is \$44 million. There is also construction associated with the facility of a multistorey car park. This is actually being delivered by the Department of Transport and Main Roads, and it is contributing \$7.37 million to that. That brings this significant sporting infrastructure enhancement at the venue, which is rapidly acquiring a keen interest from people as they drive by and see this magnificent facility being constructed, to \$51,370,000.

Mr LANGBROEK: Minister, you mentioned the expanded scope. Originally, I think last year you advised that the project would provide 528 car spaces. Stadiums Queensland now places the number at 680. Can you advise of any additional costs, or is that coming from Transport and Main Roads, who I think you said are delivering the car park?

Mr de BRENNI: There are some improvements that were requested by Netball Queensland. I do not have the detail of those to hand. They were properly considered and they were considered value for money. If the car park number has improved then I think that is a very good outcome for commuters in the electorate of Toohey. It is a good outcome for visitors to the State Netball Centre as well. In terms of the exact number of car parks, I do not have that information before me.

020

Mr LANGBROEK: The Hansen Yuncken media release says that it was 528, but Stadiums Queensland now has 680. For the committee's benefit I am interested in whether there are any extra costs within your department that you are aware of due to the increase from 528 to 680?

Mr de BRENNI: The budget is their budget as outlined, which is a Queensland government contribution of \$34 million.

Mr LANGBROEK: Thank you very much. Can I turn quickly to the Gabba upgrade plans? Can you advise us when the plans were drawn up and what is the prospect of actual delivery? I understand there is a fairly elastic time frame there.

Mr de BRENNI: I thank the member for the question. Obviously today everybody is very interested in the Gabba. I had the opportunity to walk on to the Gabba pitch myself this morning not long after sunrise. It is an opportunity not many Queenslanders get and I felt quite privileged to be there today as the Minister for Sport. We conducted a meeting with all of the hirers of our major venues to provide them with a detailed explanation of the government's response to the Stadiums Queensland Taskforce inquiry. Of course, the Stadiums Queensland Taskforce does make specific references to the Gabba and what is proposed into the future. There is a number of recommendations in the task force report that we have adopted in respect of how we manage the site going forward.

The most significant opportunity that the Gabba has had in a generation is the Cross River Rail project. Members of the committee would be aware that in coming months the Landcentre will start to be demolished, making way for the master planning of the entire Cross River Rail precinct. The Cross River Rail and Gabba precinct presents an exciting opportunity not just for people and businesses living in and around the Gabba, but also for sports fans, be they interested in cricket or AFL, or people who just want to go along to see a concert. What is envisaged is quite impressive.

Members will be aware that for some time Stadiums Queensland has been investigating, as it does with all of its venues, what infrastructure opportunities exist. Whether it is the velodrome, the Gabba or Suncorp, it consistently and constantly looks at making sure that its offerings are up to standard. I know that the Gabba has come in for some criticism over the past 12 months in terms of its standing as a stadium, but the point I want to make is that it got a very good rating in terms of its performance as critical community infrastructure by the Stadiums Queensland Taskforce. It is also held in extraordinarily high regard by Cricket Australia and the ICC. I am aware that the master plan options

that were presented by I think Populous to Stadiums Queensland in 2017 provide some opportunities and some food for thought. Of course, the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority has responsibility for the master planning of that precinct. I cannot speak to the work of the authority. It is not my portfolio area.

In terms of the significant investment that would be required by what is proposed for the Gabba redevelopment, it is really a matter for that work that is being undertaken around the whole precinct. In terms of immediate sorts of upgrades that are occurring at the stadium, the committee would be familiar with the screens that were installed recently and they would possibly be familiar with the work that has been done by Stadiums Queensland to upgrade cricket player facilities. These obviously are not visible to spectators and fans. However, given that we have Brisbane, Queensland and Australia's top cricketing athletes playing there, I am very pleased that work is going on underground at the Gabba to make sure that those facilities are world-class, and I can assure you that they are.

In conclusion, in respect of other upgrades, we have an opportunity in the near future. The committee would be aware that one of the recommendations of the task force was to go to market to test the opportunity to sell the naming rights to the Gabba on the condition that it retained the name 'the Gabba' in it. The reason we feel that it is important to retain the name 'the Gabba' in it is we think there is actual value around that. Traditionally, cricket venues have been loath to sell naming rights. I think that era is changing and there is a much greater willingness to consider that.

We were asked today what those naming rights might be worth. What we see in other jurisdictions is that naming rights go anywhere from under a million to up to nearly \$5 million a year, which was achieved with Optus in Perth. It could be somewhere in that range. We want to make sure—and we will make sure—that those funds, the revenue that does come from those naming rights, will flow through to investment in the stadium. It will flow through to improving things like bars and turnstiles and improving things like screens in back-of-house areas. It will also be worked out how we can share that revenue windfall with hirers. If that market testing is successful we should be able to see some immediate improvements in the stadium that will be noticeable to spectators into the future.

Mr LANGBROEK: Good luck stopping Treasury from getting it, Minister.

Mr KATTER: I refer to page 9 of the SDS. Will the minister explain what the government is doing to assist Queenslanders, particularly in the north, to lower the cost of high insurance premiums on their homes and address this high-impact and protracted problem, particularly in those cyclone affected areas?

Mr de BRENNI: I thank the member for the question. I think it is well known to the committee that many areas of Queensland are considered to be some of the most disaster prone in all of Australia—probably in the region generally. It is a fundamental belief of our government that every Queenslanders deserves a safe, secure and affordable place to call home. They need to feel safe and secure whether they live in Bamaga or Burleigh.

Queenslanders who live in the region from Bundaberg, all the way around the cape or down around to the Northern Territory border in towns out there—I am not entirely familiar with the small towns out there; I know Burketown is out that way—know better than anybody what it is like to sit through a category 4 or 5 cyclone. I have not sat through one, but I can only imagine what it would be like as that rages outside your home. I know that all committee members would feel for Queenslanders who have had to experience that more than once—when you see things like uprooted trees, fences coming down and that constant battering of your home, particularly when we saw Cyclone Debbie park itself over some communities for extended periods as well.

Recently I travelled to Mackay and to Proserpine. I saw some of the challenges that still exist in those communities a year after Tropical Cyclone Debbie. I met with householders whose homes are still awaiting repair. Some people still have not moved back into those homes. It is clear from what I saw that Queenslanders who reside in those pre-1984 homes are especially vulnerable to the ravages of storms and cyclones of that extent. In particular, the damage is very visible. Things like roofs are often at risk as well as windows, doors and garage doors. Those externalities that are added on to the bricks and mortar are a particular risk. Far too many Queenslanders had to experience the double whammy of the heartbreak of that cyclone damage and then, as the member for Traeger points out, their insurance premium goes up as well.

I am very pleased you have asked that question because it gives me an opportunity to announce today that the Palaszczuk government's \$20 million Household Resilience Program will open this Monday, 30 July. I want to take the opportunity to share with the committee what that is going to mean to the people of North Queensland. It will assist eligible homeowners within 50 kilometres of the Queensland coastline from Bundaberg all the way around to the Northern Territory border by providing

a grant of up to 75 per cent of the cost of improvements up to a maximum of \$11,250. That can be expended on things such as roof replacement; roof structure tie downs using external or an overbatten system; replacement of garage doors and door frames; window protection so that they include things like cyclone shutters and screens; tie downs of external structures, so that includes sheds, which is very important in regional and remote Queensland; and the replacement of external hollow core doors with solid, external grade doors. I can just imagine the sense of security a household would have after having hollow core doors replaced with strong, solid doors.

Eligible home owners need to meet certain criteria. Obviously they need to be in that exposed risk area that I have described, obviously be the owner of the home that is built before 1984 and they need to live there. We will also ensure that for the other 25 per cent we have made available no-interest loans in partnership with the industry. The other important factor is the state will pay for this work up-front so that the householder is not having to cover the cost of that on their credit card. It is an investment in regional Queensland. It is an investment in the safety and security of Queenslanders, particularly those in the far north. The other very, very good news is that it will support jobs in North Queensland.

Mr KATTER: I will put in an application next week. Thanks. I have another question. I refer to page 5 of the SDS and note recent media reports that banks may be complicit in postcode discrimination in terms of their lending practices in remote areas resulting in limited lending for home ownership in those areas. Does the minister expect this will increase demand for public housing or housing related subsidies?

Mr de BRENNI: I am not an expert in the conduct of the banking industry, but I do want to take the opportunity to speak to the work that we have been doing in supporting Queenslanders through the Queensland Housing Strategy. The committee would be aware that in 2017 we launched the 10-year strategy. It is designed to deliver 5½ thousand new social and affordable homes throughout Queensland. Increasing that supply plays a role in reducing the overall costs. It also plays a role in reducing demand so that hopefully rents become more affordable.

The \$1.6 billion Housing Construction Jobs Program that is rolling out across the state has delivered in 2017-18. In North Queensland 69 new homes are being constructed—and 30 are in the far north. That was in the 2017-18 period. Going forward, we will continue to construct those new homes to provide people with supported housing.

There are a number of other products through which the Department of Housing and Public Works supports Queenslanders such as our Pathways shared equity loan. The Queensland state housing loan is available to public housing tenants to purchase a part or a full share in their home. That allows us to then go and reinvest in building additional houses in those regions. The Queensland housing finance loan, which is a low deposit loan that does not require mortgage insurance, assists Queenslanders to access home ownership in the private market—these are available to your constituents now, member for Traeger, and mortgage relief loans to help homeowners with short-term difficulties with a no-interest loan so they are able to maintain mortgage payments and remain living in their own home.

021 There is a suite of measures that we have in place to support Queenslanders whether they live in Cooktown or whether they live in Coolangatta or whether they live in Burketown. We are constructing new homes. We are working hard to make sure that we have products that keep people in their homes and can achieve that financial independence and we have a range of products that support people into rental properties if they are not ready to buy their own home—things such as our bond loans and rental grants. Overall, we are working hard to meet that objective of all Queenslanders having a safe, secure and sustainable place to call home.

Mr KATTER: Thank you. Minister, referring to page 11 of the SDS, given a Brisbane contractor has been appointed to build the Townsville stadium, how is the government monitoring the development to ensure enough local contractors are being given the work?

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you very much for the question. This really goes to the Buy Queensland procurement strategy. The procurement decisions around the North Queensland Stadium are not necessarily matters for me to make decisions about, but I will speak to the rollout of the strategy. In September last year the Queensland government announced Buy Queensland, our procurement strategy. We indicated at that stage that we had an ambition to achieve implementation by March 2018. What we wanted to do was support those small and regional businesses, and 437 small and medium businesses call Queensland home. To ensure that my ministerial colleagues and other agencies made the right decisions to support local employment, we made it clear that the articulation of a local benefits

test should be applied. In its implementation we really wanted to show that local means local. It ensures value-for-money procurement decisions are based not on just the bottom line, which has been the previous LNP government's approach, which has really been to pursue a reduction in investment in those businesses. We want to maintain our investment in businesses but invest in the right community.

For instance, we have a range of zones. Local zone 1 is about supporting businesses within 125 kilometres of where the good or service is to be delivered. I am very pleased to say that since the commencement of the strategy 84 per cent of Queensland government work has gone to Queensland based suppliers. If we zone down to that zone 1 within 125 kilometres, which is particularly important the further you get out of the south-east, in my own agency—the decisions I am responsible for—66.34 per cent has been with local zone 1 suppliers. It is 84 per cent with Queensland and 66.34 per cent in my agency. Basically that means that 93.7 per cent of all projects under the Department of Housing and Public Works valued at over \$250,000 went to local suppliers through the use of our preference weighting under the local non-price criteria.

We are unashamedly backing Queensland jobs. I acknowledge the remark in respect of some early works packages on that particular project, but our commencement was in September 2017 and our implementation through agencies, statutory authorities and government owned corporations was March 2018. We will work hard to continue to ensure that the right decisions are made by those agencies, and I just want to let you know how we are going to do that. The 2018-19 budget for the first time in Queensland's history funds a compliance unit that will ensure that if a company tells us that they employ people who live within that 125 kilometres they actually do. If the company tells us that they are going to put on X number of apprentices and trainees, we will audit them to make sure that they do that.

For the first time in Queensland's history we will be designing the measuring and recording capability across agencies through into the Department of Housing and Public Works, where the policy administration for procurement resides, to ensure that we can measure that. If we can push that 93.7 per cent to 100 per cent, that would be great news.

In addition to all of those measures around those policy settings, when it comes to regional Queensland we deliberately and explicitly invite local contractors. We do not just put the tender out there; we actually formally invite local contractors to tender. Sometimes, though, they are not in a position to because they might have other work on. That also means that we have to work through our building and construction category management approach to ensure that we are timing our projects in a way that best supports employment, particularly in regional Queensland. If we can bring it forward or move it back a little bit we will so that local contractors have the best opportunity to get that work, and I have asked my department to consider all of those opportunities.

CHAIR: Thank you, Minister. Member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Chair. With reference to page 12 of the SDS, will the minister please outline the government's response to the stadiums task force interim report?

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you very much. As has been mentioned today already, the stadiums task force report was handed to government. The interest that has been shown reflects that stadiums are amongst our most important pieces of community infrastructure. They very much enable people to come together to enjoy sport, to enjoy great events and things like wonderful concerts. I have figures that show that in 2016-17 over 3.9 million people attended one of the nine venues owned by Stadiums Queensland—and I imagine many more attended other venues across the state as well. That is why, as part of the commencement of the preparation for the development of a sport and active recreation strategy, I announced at a meeting with sporting codes that I would evaluate the operations and hiring arrangements of our stadiums. We foreshadowed that in October 2017.

In April this year I announced that I had John Lee, who is, as you are probably aware, the former CEO of the Roosters and the Rabbitohs, who has significant governance experience, to lead a stadiums task force to consult with the hirers of our major stadia. He and the task force were asked to look at the ways that we could manage the stadiums better. Since the task force was established it has met with all of the codes and clubs and some of the promoters that utilise our venues and, as I announced earlier, this morning I have responded to the stadiums task force interim report to government.

Through this whole process we committed to make sure we addressed the reforms that we needed to in time for particular clubs to address their needs ahead of 2019—all the way through we have been impressed by the level of goodwill and cooperation by everybody involved, not just our hirers but also across various government agencies—and we committed that if there are things that we can do to make these venues work better for Queenslanders then we will act immediately. The response to the interim report does exactly that. There were 17 recommendations, all of which government either

supports or supports in principle, and our response to the report will deliver significant savings for major clubs and ensure really good-quality content at our venues for fans.

Some of the key recommendations that we have accepted include the establishment of a \$3.10 transport cap. We have had a discussion already about the potential windfall to fans at the Gabba that would accrue from naming rights. We have made a decision to significantly reduce the Metricon Stadium sinking fund contributions that are currently made by the AFL. We have made a commitment to deliver better traffic management plans around our venues but particularly those on the Gold Coast and we have asked TransLink to deliver the bus services for those Gold Coast venues. The findings in the report highlighted that patrons on the Gold Coast were paying up to 50 per cent more in transport costs than those at Brisbane based venues and that those higher transport costs were predominantly due to the delivery of bus services. We will be reducing transport costs across-the-board. These are not simple things for us to do, but we are committed to delivering a good outcome for Queenslanders.

I am aware that similar issues were raised in 2012 and 2013 and they were not addressed, but we are very pleased today to have moved swiftly. This is an interim report. There will be further work done by the stadiums task force to look at a range of other matters. I think it is probably appropriate, given that there may be further questions about it and it is a significant report which has a significant impact on Queenslanders, that, for the benefit of Queenslanders, I seek leave of the committee to table the stadium task force interim report, the Queensland government response and a summary document, should the committee wish to receive that request. We have copies for the committee. I think you will see from your review of the stadiums task force report that John Lee and his team have done good work and you will see from the response that the Queensland government has made clear decisions to support the recommendations. The response to the report I think heralds a new era of partnership between the Queensland government and our major sporting codes.

CHAIR: Is leave granted to have this tabled? Leave is granted.

Mr de BRENNI: The response to the report heralds a new era of partnership between our sporting codes, the Queensland government and Stadiums Queensland, and I cannot express enough my appreciation to everybody involved in the process in terms of pulling this together and getting a decision in the time frame that allows in particular the Gold Coast Suns and the Titans to prepare for the 2019 season.

There will be a final report provided by John Lee and his team. That will examine a range of other issues in relation to the stadiums such as event attractions and how we can ensure that the stadiums as assets are utilised most effectively and efficiently to get the best outcome for Queenslanders. I think everyone in Queensland would be interested in the analysis that the task force will do in respect of the price of chips and beer and other food and beverages at those stadiums. It will also look importantly at the future infrastructure needs of the state—that is, what do we need in terms of other stadiums? We of course have the North Queensland Stadium that is being constructed currently, but what else is needed in other places? It will look at the policing and security models that are used at other venues and whether we can learn from those and implement improvements here in Queensland.

Mrs MILLER: Minister, I note that the Administrative Arrangements Amendment Order (No. 1) 2018 states that the minister is responsible for digital economy facilitation of access to government owned optical fibre networks. In relation to Ipswich City Council again, my constituents want to know if the department can investigate any private emails used by Ipswich city councillors for official purposes other than their officially supplied email addresses. I table the media reports in relation to Councillor Paul Tully, who has been using IpswichCityCouncil@gmail.com and PaulGTully@gmail.com for official purposes. The director-general might want to answer this, but my constituents want to know if your department can investigate this incredible use of these email addresses.

022 **Mr de BRENNI:** I have just consulted with the director-general. The director-general and I concur that the Department of Housing and Public Works does not have the power or a framework in any case for the investigation of emails.

Mrs MILLER: Can you provide advice to the Ipswich City Council and other councillors across Queensland in the use of these emails? I believe that, even though Paul Tully is getting away with this in Ipswich, that other councillors or other councils across Queensland might also be doing the same thing. I think they are in desperate need of guidance.

Mr de BRENNI: I acknowledge your comments, member for Bundamba. The Department of Housing and Public Works can provide advice to public authorities on appropriate record-keeping practices in terms of investigating their emails. As I understand it, that is a matter really for the CCC.

Mrs MILLER: That is the investigative part of it, yes, but now I am asking about advice, because it appears to me that that local government definitely needs some advisory role in relation to these matters.

CHAIR: Is this the right portfolio?

Mrs MILLER: It is IT.

CHAIR: Okay.

Mr de BRENNI: I share the chair's view, but I also acknowledge the member's query and acknowledge that the issues of conduct at this public authority are of concern. I think that we can probably provide advice around record keeping, but I do not think that it goes to the extent of any level of investigation or anything like that—certainly not powers within the Department of Housing and Public Works. Director-general, is there any other—

Ms Carroll: The State Archivist within the department provides advice to government authorities about what is appropriate record keeping, what needs to be kept et cetera. Certainly, we can look at how we could provide some of that advice to local authorities.

Mrs MILLER: That would be excellent. Thank you very much for that response. I have another question in relation to the Ipswich City Mall, and particularly in relation to the Icon building there. For those who are not aware, the Ipswich City Mall redevelopment has been the subject of some controversy lately in relation to development approvals. I know that there are quite a number of government departments and government agencies within this Icon building. My understanding is that the Ipswich City Council has to pay for any floor space that is unoccupied in Icon. My question is: has there been any undue pressure put on the department or even any other state government departments or agencies to lease floor space in that building?

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you for the question, member for Bundamba. Certainly, I am not aware of any undue pressure being applied to the Department of Housing and Public Works. It is not something that we respond to—undue pressure. We respond to the appropriate needs of Queenslanders and meet our duties and proper obligations. I am not aware of the lease arrangements that exist at the Icon building, but I am certainly happy to take some time to consider what lease arrangements are in place there and provide you with some further information at a further date.

Mrs MILLER: Can you take that on notice, please?

Mr de BRENNI: I am not sure that I am going to be able to meet the standing order arrangements to be able to investigate the lease arrangements in the time frames for the committee for questions on notice. I would prefer to give you an undertaking to investigate the lease arrangements and provide you with an appropriate briefing as quickly as possible. I just think that 48 hours to—

Mrs MILLER: No, that is fine. It is just that the people of Ipswich understand that it is in the council's interests to pressure all other government departments to take up leasing space there so that they do not have to pay for it. Do you see what I am saying?

Mr de BRENNI: I understand, yes.

CHAIR: I was just going to say that I do not know if the minister could answer on behalf of other departments. Are you giving an undertaking—

Mrs MILLER: They are the essential lease agency.

Mr de BRENNI: The director-general just made a positive confirmation for me that the staff of the Department of Housing and Public Works have received no pressure, but I am happy to provide a briefing to you, member for Bundamba, around the lease arrangements that prevail at the premises.

Mrs MILLER: On behalf of your department, or all the departments?

Ms Carroll: We do the leasing right across government.

Mrs MILLER: Yes, I know.

Ms Carroll: Through the government office accommodation, but to the best of my knowledge I have had nothing brought to me that has said that there has been any pressure to bear. Normally, what happens is that, when lease space is needed to be leased—a lease is coming to the end—the staff investigate all options, look at what is the best location et cetera. Certainly, we can look at what leases exist within the Icon building and different departments and when they expire et cetera.

Mrs MILLER: Can I have a follow-up question, please?

Mr SORENSEN: Point of order. Can I just ask if that report is going to come back to this committee or is it just going back to the member?

CHAIR: There is no point of order. We will wait until your block of questions if you wish to ask. We will continue on with this.

Mr de BRENNI: Chair, do you want me to answer that?

CHAIR: Let us go with that, then.

Mr de BRENNI: I think the member for Bundamba was seeking a further question.

CHAIR: The member for Bundamba had another question. I would rather continue with that.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you.

Mrs MILLER: I have another question in relation to the department of housing. Can I place on record that Geoff Schafferius and the housing team at Ipswich do an absolutely wonderful job. I would like to thank them for their contribution to our city.

Mr de BRENNI: Hear, hear!

Mrs MILLER: The department of housing owns significant landholdings in Collingwood Park near Redbank Plaza—one of our biggest shopping centres. Would the minister and the department consider allowing the construction of lightweight housing on this land like you see in retirement villages so that seniors can access more public housing in the area?

Mr de BRENNI: I think that is an excellent question. The Department of Housing and Public Works under the Queensland Housing Strategy has an ambitious goal in terms of the delivery of additional social housing in the region. I note that, over the next 10 years, in that area that you are referring to it is forecast that people over the age of 55 will grow by about 31 per cent. When you talk about the types of dwellings that you see in retirement villages, I see where you are coming from.

Under the Housing Construction Jobs Program that we have announced, the regional target for Ipswich over the next five years is 383 new homes. We have lots of opportunities to consider what we deliver out there. I understand that the area around Collingwood Park is prone to subsidence.

Mrs MILLER: I live there. I am well aware of it.

Mr de BRENNI: Yes.

Mrs MILLER: This particular land is very valuable. Even though there are mines underneath Collingwood Park, the point is that we are sick of this land being vacant. We do not want necessarily slab-on-ground construction; we are looking at the lightweight type of housing that could be put in that area. That would really solve a lot of issues in relation to the department's goal to provide seniors housing and our goal to have that land used.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, member. I have been impressed by some of the developments that have been made in terms of the different types of housing construction methods that we are seeing in Queensland. We have been very keen to work with the construction industry in looking at innovation in how we deliver our homes. I am very willing to look at a range of options so that we can get the best use out of the portfolio.

Of course, we will absolutely balance the need to get those 383 new homes to market to provide a home for vulnerable Queenslanders in the Ipswich region as quickly as possible with the opportunity that we have to create jobs and utilise that available government space. Thank you very much for bringing it to my attention. It is fairly and squarely on my radar. I am happy to continue to provide briefings and discussions with you as we progress rolling out that program in that area. The consideration of this particular area I am happy to make a priority so it is one of the first things that we discuss going forward.

CHAIR: Thank you, Minister. Member for Hervey Bay?

Mr SORENSEN: I will ask the member for Burleigh to ask questions.

Mr HART: Good afternoon, Minister, and everybody in the room. Thank you for allowing me to ask questions today. Minister, I refer to pages 1 and 43 of the SDS. The minister would have seen the outrage in the building and business peak bodies over the past few days since the appointment of CFMEU activist Jade Ingham to the QBCC board. It appeared quietly on your department's website. I table extracts from the *Courier-Mail* today for the benefit of the committee. Will the minister now agree that this was a mistake?

CHAIR: Excuse me, member if you seek leave to table that, I hope you have copies for everyone.

Mr HART: There are copies there.

CHAIR: You need to seek leave. We will wait until they are distributed, but continue on.

Mr HART: Minister, I am sure you have read the *Courier-Mail* today. Will you now admit that the appointment of Mr Ingham was a mistake and remove him from the board of the QBCC?

CHAIR: Are you asking for an opinion?

Mr HART: No.

CHAIR: It seems that you are asking for an opinion. Minister, do you wish to answer that?

Mr de BRENNI: I am very happy to answer the member's question. I will say first of all that everybody whom I talk to in the construction industry is fine with the appointment. I will say this. It is our government's policy that, just because you are a union member, you are a union official, or a union activist, does not rule you out of performing civic duty for this state. Let me make that very clear.

Mr HART: Sure.

Mr de BRENNI: In all of the conversations that I have had with the building and construction industry since the appointment process, nobody has raised with me—nobody has raised with me—any concerns.

I want to outline for the benefit of the committee how we arrived at making these appointments. We made amendments to the relevant act that established the QBCC through amendments to the Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Act 2017 and the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991. When they went to parliament last year, we decided to broaden representation on the QBCC board to make it more reflective of industry and to give it a greater level of on-the-ground experience in terms of ensuring that the strategy of the QBCC was reflective of where the industry needed to go. I sought appointments and advice from representatives of workers, subcontractors and builders.

I want to quote from a letter to Master Builders Queensland, which made a nomination as well that I accepted. I also accepted a nomination in respect of subcontractors and I accepted a nomination from the CFMEU. In my letter I say—

I would appreciate your thoughts on suitable individuals for appointment to the Board.

In considering any future appointments to the Board, it is my intention to ensure that the interests of occupational licensees, sub-contractors and consumers are adequately represented.

Further, the Governor in Council must have regard to a nominee's skills and experience when appointing Members to the QBC Board, including the individuals experience and competence in the areas of building and construction, finance, corporate governance and risk, insurance, including knowledge and experience in the reinsurance market, consumer advocacy and awareness, and the public sector. I deemed it that the nominees that were received, representing builders, subcontractors and workers' representatives, brought a greater level of experience and competence to the board of QBCC and I welcome the appointment of the workers' representative as well as the subcontractor and builders' representative.

023

CHAIR: Before we continue, the member sought leave to have this tabled. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. I will say, though, that the committee had agreed that there would be nothing larger than an A4 size tabled. The member brought that A3 size one along as a prop. The member for Callide earlier also had a prop. There are no yellow cards here, but let us tone it down a bit and show a bit of respect for the process. You did not need to bring one that big. The A4 was big enough. We have accepted that as tabled. Next question, please.

Mr HART: Thank you for your guidance, Chair. I understand Mr Ingham does not have a federal entry permit as he failed the fit and proper test of the Industrial Commission. Can you tell me how he passed the QBCC's fit and proper test?

Mr de BRENNI: The ordinary appointment process for appointments to Queensland government boards—maybe you do not remember how it is done, member for Burleigh, so I will remind you—is that suitable nominees are sought with a requisite level of skills and experience. It is my task, as the minister responsible, to assess their skills and experience. I then make a recommendation to cabinet and cabinet assesses their skills and experience and notes that the relevant checks are made for background. Cabinet approves my recommendation and the Governor signs that off.

Mr HART: Just to clarify, Minister, you make the decision? There is no fit and proper test; is that correct?

Mr de BRENNI: That is completely inconsistent with what I just said, member for Burleigh.

Mr HART: It is what you just said.

CHAIR: You are making a real inference there. You asked the minister a question. The minister answered the question. Do you have another question?

Mr HART: Yes, I do. Can I call forward the commissioner for the QBCC, please. Welcome, Commissioner. This question refers to SDS page 43. With reference to the answer to question on notice No. 9 and the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme, can you advise how much was paid out of the Home Warranty Scheme and how much was recovered from directors of companies involved under section 26 of the act?

Mr Bassett: Good afternoon, committee, and I thank the member for their question. Could I respectfully ask that the member repeat the question? I just want to make sure I get it right.

Mr HART: In relation to the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme, can you advise the committee how much was paid out of the scheme and how much was recovered from directors under section 26 of the act?

Mr Bassett: I thank the member for the question. I can confirm that for the 2017-18 financial year the total of insurance claims paid out under the Home Warranty Scheme was \$47.5 million. That is broken down into \$17.4 million for non-completion; defects, \$25.5 million; subsidence, \$4.6 million. I will have to seek some advice in respect of the recovery under section 25 and I will see if I can get that information for the committee as soon as possible today.

Mr HART: Minister, will you take that on notice?

CHAIR: The minister does not have to take anything on notice. The commissioner said he would attempt to get it back by the end of the session. If that does not happen we will look at taking it on notice.

Mr de BRENNI: Which particular part?

Mr HART: How much was recovered.

Mr de BRENNI: Under the Home Warranty Scheme, for home owners?

Mr HART: No, from the directors of companies that the insurance was paid out on behalf of.

Mr de BRENNI: If the commissioner has that information to hand this afternoon we will be able to provide that.

Mr HART: Commissioner, section 71 of the QBCC Act allows the commission to pursue directors and others who benefit financially to recover funds paid out under the Home Warranty Scheme. Can you advise under what conditions the QBCC would not seek to recover those funds?

Mr Bassett: I thank the member for their question. You are correct in saying that we do have the power and the capacity to recover funds from directors against whom we pay out under the Home Warranty Scheme. What often happens—and I do not have the specific details in front of me—is that when we seek to recover funds, sometimes the licensee against whom we are seeking to recover the funds goes into insolvency. Once that happens, we do not necessarily have the ability to get those funds recovered. We may also make a commercial decision that it is not, in fact, appropriate to seek to recover those funds.

Mr HART: Commissioner, can I raise the issue of Garry David Hall, who has been before the QBCC and in front of the Brisbane Magistrates Court.

CHAIR: Are you allowed to name individuals? Are you sure it is appropriate?

Mr HART: It is a public record in front of the Brisbane Magistrates Court—

CHAIR: Okay, it is your question.

Mr HART:—where he stated that the debt was, in fact, his wife's. Can you advise the outcome of that case?

CHAIR: Minister?

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Chair. It will be the government's approach not to entertain the discussion of particular individual's matters in this process. If the member for Burleigh has questions of policy that go to the Appropriations Bill or the SDS we will entertain answering those, but seeking to ventilate the outcome of matters before a tribunal or court in respect of an individual's case, their business, their home or whatever it might be is not appropriate. Chair, I ask you to consider ruling the detail of the question in particular out of order.

CHAIR: I agree, Minister. I do not find it relevant and I will ask you to move on, please, member.

Mr HART: Minister, that is all well and good, but it is quite relevant. My point is that at the end of the day there was no outcome at the end of this particular court case and, in fact, this person's wife may have been a former Labor member of parliament and I wonder whether that may have had any influence here.

CHAIR: I find that highly inappropriate. You are casting a real aspersion, member. I suggest you change your line of questioning or we might move on and find someone else to ask a question.

Mr HART: A question to the commissioner, then. Commissioner, have you had any interaction with the minister or any government official about cases involving former members of parliament?

Mr Bassett: I thank the member for their question. I am the commissioner of an independent statutory authority. We have a piece of legislation that we must administer. We have to make sure that we balance the interests of both the consumer and contractors. Absolutely not, I have had no conversations with any member of parliament in respect of any decision made under the Home Warranty Scheme.

CHAIR: Thank you for that answer, Commissioner. I hope there are no more questions along this line.

Mr HART: I am moving on, Chair. Minister, in terms of SDS page 5, I refer to a parliamentary question on notice No. 654 and the response to that. I seek leave to table that response for the information of the minister.

CHAIR: It is a question on notice it is public, so I do not think we need to seek leave to table it. Leave is granted.

Mr HART: This is a response from your office and there are a couple of numbers I would like you to have a look at. You will see that on 31 December 2012 applications for public housing were at 23,550. At the change of government in January 2015 that number had fallen to 16,546.

CHAIR: How far back are you going? This is a current appropriation bill, remember.

Mr HART: This is a question on notice and I am referring to it. Over that two-year-one-month period under the LNP housing applications fell by 7,004, yet you will see that that number has now risen to 16,761. It has, in fact, risen by 215 in the period of your government. Has your housing policy failed?

CHAIR: Are you asking for an opinion there, member?

Mr HART: How do you explain that outcome?

Mr de BRENNI: I can explain that the Palaszczuk government, in both its first term and its second term, has had a considered and determined effort to grow the number of social and affordable homes constructed in Queensland. I find the hypocrisy that is represented by this question extraordinary, when the member for Burleigh's government oversaw the construction of a couple of dozen homes in its entire term when on average we have constructed somewhere in the vicinity exceeding 600 a year since 2017-18 and in this year we will construct 600 new and commence approximately another 400. If those 600 are constructed within the space of a year, that will deliver another 1,000 homes for Queenslanders. That is what we have been doing year on year.

The policy of the Liberal National Party—you wanted to go back to 2012-13 so let us go back to 2012-13, and it is relevant because the member for Burleigh made it relevant—was couple fold. First of all it was to sell the publicly owned public housing portfolio—a \$15 billion public asset sell-off and partial giveaway, turning its back on the most vulnerable people in this state: Queenslanders with a disability, the elderly and women escaping domestic and family violence. They are the people in the social housing register, member for Burleigh. You can be creative about all the figures you like under your administration—

Mr Hart interjected.

CHAIR: Member, you asked the minister a question. I will ask you to allow him to answer.

Mr de BRENNI: The way that you address the social housing register is to provide homes for people to live in, member for Burleigh.

Mr HART: It doesn't seem to be working.

Mr de BRENNI: The Liberal National Party's only policy was to sell off public housing. The other policy—as I mentioned, it was several fold—was to pursue a target in terms of increasing the number of evictions. You are enamoured of the idea of evicting social housing tenants, pushing them into homelessness. As I mentioned, the people who are on this register are people who are living with a disability, are elderly or are victims of domestic and family violence.

We have built thousands more. Let me give you the facts, member for Burleigh. Under your administration 69 homes commenced in 2012-13. This year we will commence over 600—69 versus 600. The housing register can go up and down based on a range of things, particularly the housing market, the availability of other rental properties and changes in population, but the facts that you cannot hide from, member for Burleigh, and that quite frankly you should be ashamed of, are that in 2012-13 there were 69 commencements and in 2013-14 there were only 79. Under the Palaszczuk Labor government we will build over the next five years 684 in Brisbane and 392 on the Gold Coast. We have done more per year on the Gold Coast, in the electorate of Burleigh, than the LNP did in its entire term.

Mr HART: And yet the numbers have gone up.


CHAIR: Thank you, Minister.

Mr SORENSEN: Can I ask a question?

CHAIR: We are due now to adjourn for a break. This hearing will resume at 4.45 pm with the continued examination of the estimates for the Housing, Public Works, Digital Technology and Sport portfolio areas.

Proceedings suspended from 4.15 pm to 4.45 pm.

024

 **CHAIR:** Welcome, Minister and officials. The committee will now continue its examination of the proposed expenditure of the Housing, Public Works, Digital Technology and Sport portfolio areas.

Mr MELLISH: Minister, with reference to page 12 of the SDS, can you please outline what your plans are to consult with Queenslanders when developing the Sport and Recreation Strategy?

Mr de BRENNI: Today we have had a great opportunity to canvass many issues in relation to sport. I welcome the opportunity, because I think that almost all Queenslanders really do live and breathe sport and almost all of us have had the opportunity to participate in sport and recreation at some stage in our lives. We know that Queenslanders are pretty good at sport, too. We certainly dominate the leader board and the medal tallies.

I have had some recent opportunities to observe the great work that has been done at all levels in sport in Queensland recently. On the weekend, I had the opportunity to be in Cooktown. I congratulate the Northern Pride on their victory over the Ipswich Jets, in what was a tough game in difficult circumstances. I congratulate the Queensland Firebirds on their recent emphatic win and also my home football team, the Rochedale Rovers, who performed particularly well in an impromptu match against the Western Sydney Wanderers the other night, when they needed a bit of competition at warm-up.

I want to make sure that Queensland teams continue to dominate, regardless of what sport they play. Government has an important role to play as well, in terms of boosting participation in sport, supporting our elite athletes and building sports infrastructure. I want to do that because sport is a very key driver in health outcomes, employment outcomes and social and community benefits. It opens doors—as I have seen this week at the Victoria Point Sharks Sporting Club—for communities to have conversations about things such as mental illness and other things that are confronting our communities such as suicide. Of course, sport plays a role as a community connector in both regional and metropolitan areas.

As I mentioned earlier, on 16 October last year at the Gabba I met with sporting codes to begin the development of Queensland's first-ever sport and active recreation strategy. As part of the strategy, I want to hear from all Queenslanders. I want to hear how we can make it easier to get out and get active, how we can better support community clubs, how we can support the next generation of our Commonwealth athletes and how we can better fund and support the construction of appropriate infrastructure across the state. To support that discussion with Queenslanders, today I am very pleased to release the *Queensland Sport and Active Recreation Strategy Discussion Paper*. I seek leave of the committee to table the discussion paper for the benefit of the committee and the benefit of the record.

This discussion paper will be a useful tool for Queenslanders, whether they be sports administrators, sports fans or participants at all levels as we embark on a statewide roadshow during which we will be meeting with Queenslanders directly. I will be visiting sports clubs and speaking to people attending our major stadiums. I will be holding open-door consultation forums. I hope to fit in a few park runs in various locations around Queensland, if anyone wants to give me a shout out and invite me to their local park run. In addition, we will do some important deep-dive sessions where we will spend significant effort hearing from sectors of the industry, particularly those who are interested in working with the Queensland government around disability, around achieving better health outcomes through sport and, of course, around how we can improve educational outcomes through sport. Sport

and recreation are an important element of Queensland's way of life and we want to ensure that it gets better for people and that everybody has a say.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the sports strategy ambassadors. I acknowledge Paige Leonhardt, the swimmer who is pictured on the front cover of the discussion paper. She is one of Queensland's very young up-and-coming stars who represented us at the Commonwealth Games. I acknowledge Gretel Tippett, the netballer; Jason Cadee, the basketballer; Emily Bates, who is an AFL player; Sammie Treherne, who is a Rugby Union player; Sam Day from the Gold Coast Suns in AFL; and Abbey Lloyd and Henrique who play football for the Brisbane Roar. I am very pleased that they are going to be joining us as we embark on this process of consultation with Queenslanders around how we can make sport more fun, more affordable and more equal for all Queenslanders.

CHAIR: Minister, you sought leave to have this document tabled. Leave is granted. Minister, we have heard a little about female participation in sport, which is great. Could you please explain what steps the Palaszczuk government is taking to encourage more women and girls to participate in sport and active recreation?

Mr de BRENNI: As is outlined in the discussion paper, sport is crucial for boosting the physical and mental health and wellbeing of Queenslanders. I am sure there is no doubt that all committee members recognise that. We know that participation helps you feel connected to your community. It provides a strong network of support around athletes. We also know that fewer women and girls than boys are participating in sport across the state. However, we are seeing that that is beginning to change, which is really good.

The biggest concern that I think faces us is the nosedive in female participation as girls hit their teenage years. There are a few reasons for that that we are aware of. One of the main reasons is a lack of appropriate facilities—things such as change rooms for women and girls at Queensland sporting clubs. Most women would feel uncomfortable getting changed in the men's facilities with little or no privacy, particularly if they need to share with the boys or men in those clubs. Many of the sporting facilities in Queensland were built in an era when participation of women in sport was not accepted or celebrated in the way that it is today. Certainly there was very clear gender segregation in the types of sport that women would play, generally.

That is why I was very excited to hear the Premier announce the Female Facilities Program, which is a \$15 million program for the provision and upgrade of facilities right across the state to make sports organisations more welcoming for women and girls. As the committee is probably aware, there are \$500,000 grants to ensure that women and girls get to participate. I am pleased to say that 45 projects were approved under the program, out of 186 applications. We are funding the big sports such as Aussie Rules, Rugby League, Rugby Union, soccer and cricket, and also sports such as softball, sailing and, of course, netball. Forty per cent of the projects are being delivered outside south-east Queensland.

I think that is a good outcome for regional Queensland, in particular, because the value of the infrastructure that is being delivered, whether it is in regional Queensland or in the south-east, cannot be understated. It gives every Queenslanders, regardless of their gender, the opportunity to learn life skills such as resilience, teamwork, perseverance, how to turn up, how to win and how to lose sometimes too, and also to be a part of those supportive communities that many of us take for granted. Sporting communities do not support their members just on the field; they support them off the field, too. I and I am sure committee members are very familiar with sporting clubs rallying around people who are doing it tough. When people are suffering with an illness or have lost a loved one, often the sporting clubs provide the social infrastructure that really holds up those people when everything else seems to be all too hard.

That is why it is so important that we see these projects roll out across the state. I think we all agree that in 2018 it is ridiculous that something as simple as toilet blocks or change facilities are still a barrier to women and girls participating in sport. However, with the delivery of the Female Facilities Program in so many locations, that is rapidly changing. I congratulate the successful applicants and I look forward to seeing more women and girls participate, right across the state.

Mrs MILLER: My question relates to housing department home loans. I raise this issue because, when I was a lot younger, my husband and I had a housing department home loan. It was for people who did not earn a lot of money. It really set us up for life. I am wondering if those home loans still exist and what the criteria are.

Mr de BRENNI: As you say, the Queensland housing finance loan has been around for some time. It assists Queenslanders to access home ownership through the private market. It is one of a suite

of tools that the department has in its toolbox. We need to ensure that we do not have a one-size-fits-all approach; that it is not just about creating social housing for people to rent, but that we help people achieve independence, as well.

I am really excited that through the Queensland Housing Strategy we are trialling at the moment the development of housing pathway plans to assist people to move from tenancy in social housing. They might be exiting a custodial sentence and we assist them on a plan to move into their own housing. Things such as the Queensland housing finance loan can assist with that. It is a low-deposit loan, as I mentioned before to the member for Traeger, I think. They come without mortgage insurance. They have had peaks and troughs in terms of their popularity for Queenslanders, based on the costs of acquiring credit elsewhere. Very small numbers are approved each year.

I think some work is needed in terms of the availability and the awareness of Queenslanders around these Queensland housing finance loans, particularly given that in some parts of Queensland we are seeing the median house prices really starting to shift. Our strong economy and the number of jobs that we see growing in Queensland are putting pressure on some housing markets. We have not seen the shift in housing affordability that we have seen in Sydney and Melbourne, but that does not mean that it would be appropriate for us to rest on our laurels and not have a plan in place in case the market started to head that way. I thank the member for the question. We do have plans under the Housing Strategy's first three-year action plan to fully develop a contemporary version of those tools for the use of Queenslanders, so that those who do have the dream and aspiration of owning their own home can better achieve that with a little help from the Queensland government.

Mrs MILLER: Do you mind if I explore that a little further for the benefit of my community? I need to know how much deposit they need to have and what the income cut-offs are.

Mr de BRENNI: There are income cut-offs. We can probably provide that detail for you fairly quickly this afternoon. It is available on the Department of Housing and Public Works website. From my memory, for the loan a two per cent deposit was required. I will check the income eligibility criteria.

025 We want to make sure that we do not put Queenslanders immediately into mortgage stress. One of the criteria I recall is ensuring that the applicant can demonstrate that they can meet the requirements. The eligibility criteria is that you have to be a Queenslanders. You have to live in Queensland and be a citizen. You cannot own another property. It has to be the only property that you have purchased. The household income needs to be under \$141,000 per annum. A couple on average incomes are probably going to be eligible. They have to intend to live in the property, have a good credit history and not have a bunch of debts. It is really about making sure they can service the loan and we are not putting them in a position of likely default. Obviously, they have to have savings to cover the deposit and other costs such as legal fees and stamp duty. They have to be able to afford the loan repayments without hardship.

Mrs MILLER: Is this just for first home owners or can it be for anybody?

Mr de BRENNI: It is available to anybody who meets those criteria.

CHAIR: Earlier we briefly touched on the new Queensland government procurement policy. Could you flesh out a bit the recent enhancements to the government procurement policy?

Mr de BRENNI: We are very proud of the Buy Queensland procurement strategy that was launched in July 2017 and commenced in September. It was really designed to make procurement work better for Queenslanders by supporting more Queensland businesses. When we support Queensland businesses they can employ more Queenslanders. Spending that government money locally gives them real confidence to hire, and particularly to give young people or people re-entering the workforce a bit of a go. That is really at the heart of the policy.

The Queensland Procurement Policy has now been enhanced with some real clarity around some elements of it. The enhancements are designed to back even more Queensland jobs. From 8 May 2018 the best practice principles for major projects of \$100 million or more or declared projects below that value apply. What we are really doing here is defining a statement that we made in the procurement strategy around quality jobs. We indicated that we wanted to do business with Queensland businesses that we thought were ethical businesses. We talked about quality jobs and safer workplaces. We are really unpacking that now for Queensland businesses.

The following principles will be included as part of supplier evaluation and selection: workplace health and safety systems and standards—we are going to provide a preference to companies that can demonstrate that these principles are soundly met; commitment to apprentices and trainees, which is quite important, there is no doubt about that; best practice industrial relations; and a history of

compliance with procurement tendering and other government policy. We are making sure that we are supporting businesses that engage with their staff cooperatively and that strive for best practice in their workplaces. We want to make sure that when we spend taxpayers' money we do it with a Queensland business, but we want to make sure they are quality and decent jobs as well.

Other enhancements confirm our commitment to preference businesses that are training the next generation of tradies through apprenticeships. From 1 June 2018 the Queensland Procurement Policy commits the government to increasing its procurement with genuine social enterprises. That commitment will really promote diverse and inclusive workforces and communities. It will create training and employment opportunities. I have seen many of these already occurring for disadvantaged jobseekers in communities. It will support small and medium enterprises and encourage local economic development. Importantly, I want to assure the committee that the preferencing of those social enterprises means that we will do business with social enterprises that pay fair award based wages as well. It is really important that they meet that benchmark.

We have also committed to ensure full accessibility for people with a disability. Disability advocates have been invited to be part of the government's industry engagement approach. We want to make sure that when we purchase anything we purchase things that meet important disability standards.

I mentioned before that Buy Queensland is supported by a strengthened compliance unit. That kicked off on 1 July 2018. It will be auditing supplier compliance with all of the principles, and particularly the apprenticeship and traineeship requirements. It will be looking at conducting proactive audits. It will be regularly checking. It will use industry intelligence as well. I think that is the other important thing. We have some well-developed structures of engagement with industry around procurement. Industry intelligence is coming in to us not only around how we approach procurement but also around making sure that the commitments that are given by businesses that supply to government are met. The compliance unit will continue to reinforce industry and public confidence that procurement delivers for Queensland businesses and delivers for Queensland workers.

CHAIR: Member for Maiwar, do you have a question? You have been waiting patiently for quite a while.

Mr BERKMAN: I do have a question. Firstly, I seek leave to table a couple of documents, if I may.

CHAIR: Are there copies of those?

Mr BERKMAN: There are copies. The first document is ABS data showing the total number of residential dwellings, nationally and broken down by state, back to mid-2016.

CHAIR: Leave is granted for the tabling.

Mr BERKMAN: I have one further document that I would seek to table as well. This is a document from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare showing the total number of social housing dwellings nationally and broken down by state. That is from mid-2016 as well.

CHAIR: We will wait until that is distributed. Leave is granted for the tabling.

Mr BERKMAN: These two documents together show that midway through the government's last term the proportion of social housing in Queensland was about 3.6 per cent, or a bit closer to 3.7 per cent. I will give the minister a moment to check my sums there, if he is so inclined.

Mr de BRENNI: Carry on.

Mr BERKMAN: I have a further document that I could table, but I doubt it is necessary. I was going to refer to a few pages of the Queensland government's Housing Strategy for the next 10 years. This shows the government's plan to provide 4,522 social homes or about 1.2 per cent of the forecast increase of 380,000 homes over the next 10 years.

CHAIR: Is there a question coming?

Mr BERKMAN: There is a question. It is coming right now. Can you confirm for the committee, as these documents demonstrate, that the government's Housing Strategy for the next 10 years will deliver a reduction in the proportion of social housing provided in Queensland?

Mr de BRENNI: What I can speak to is the figures in the appropriation bills and policies of government. The forecast figures for the private residential sector are a matter for the private residential sector. We will deliver 5½ thousand new social and affordable homes through our budget under the Queensland Housing Strategy. That I can confirm.

I think the member's point is in terms of an ambition to increase the amount of social and affordable housing. We recognise that many Queenslanders are vulnerable and doing it tough, particularly people on very low incomes, key workers, women and children escaping domestic and family violence and elderly Queenslanders, for whom the costs of private rental or private household ownership are quite high. That is why in 2017 we delivered the Queensland Housing Strategy. A record spend like that has not been seen without significant federal government intervention, with the nation-building funding almost a decade ago.

I am pleased and proud of the effort that has been applied by the Palaszczuk Labor government into the construction of these homes. I am also very pleased to report to the committee that, whilst we anticipated that our growth approach in 2017-18 would deliver 599 homes, that target has been exceeded. In fact, 720 homes have been delivered.

More and more Queenslanders are buying their own homes and therefore the state is growing. I made some remarks earlier about the growth in the state and the attraction for people to move here. Business confidence is certainly leading to growth in all parts of the state. The social housing portfolio under the Palaszczuk Labor government is growing at a significant rate.

As the member for Bundamba pointed out for the committee, we are also providing a range of other tools for people to secure safe and sustainable housing. I understand that there are various views about the rate of growth of social housing and that more should be done. I also think that many Queenslanders would prefer an element of support so that they can achieve their own independence. That is why things like the housing finance loan, our bond loans so that people can join the private residential market, our rental grants and a range of other things to support people are important.

We have taken a sophisticated view that the bricks-and-mortar-only approach to supporting Queenslanders find a safe, secure and affordable place to call home is not the way to go. We have worked closely with the community housing sector as well. We are working on a range of social benefit bonds to see private sector investment into supported housing for young people. We have the Family Coach—Sure Steps project that has commenced. The next step home for women on parole has commenced. Construction of the NRL Cowboys girls house in Townsville is underway.

Our youth to work policy is breaking the unemployment cycle in social housing. Most people I meet in social housing who are my age were born into that home. There have been perverse disincentives in the system for a very long time. It meant that if that individual went and got themselves a job when they finished high school we would assess their income as part of the household income and take 25 per cent of their income. Alternatively, that income would push them over the household rent eligibility.

For a long time we were asking young Queenslanders to make a decision between having a job or being homeless. When I left high school the decision I was making was where I was going to go for schoolies and what pub I was going to go to on a Saturday afternoon. For kids in social housing in Queensland, the choice we as a society were asking them to make for a long time was between having a job or making their parents homeless. Our youth to work initiative has reformed that. It is starting to get traction. A sophisticated approach to all of those things is ensuring that the social housing portfolio is growing at a rate better than expected.

026 Mr BERKMAN: The response, as I understand it, is that you do not accept on face value that figure of 380,000 growth that is included in the Queensland Housing Strategy as a basis to determine the shift in the proportion of social housing.

CHAIR: Are you seeking an opinion, member?

Mr BERKMAN: No. My question is: do you accept the figure in the Queensland government's own Housing Strategy as a reasonable basis to calculate the shift in the proportion of social housing over the next 10 years?

Mr de BRENNI: Of course I accept figures that are published in government documents. I am wondering though when you intend to put the question.

Mr BERKMAN: That was the question. I will certainly put another one though. I understand that in 2017 there were more than 6,000 new applications approved for social housing which is almost 10 times more than the 659-odd social homes that the government plans to deliver this year. What are the government's plans for the many thousands of people in need of social housing who will miss out this year and every year through to 2027?

CHAIR: I think the minister, in his fulsome answer before, answered that. Is there anything you wish to add, Minister?

Mr de BRENNI: I do not want to tread on the standing orders around repetition in my answer—I see the member for Burleigh—other than to simply say that a significant investment in social housing is being made. We are achieving beyond our targets. There is a suite of programs. Perhaps some of the most effective tools to address the affordability of housing for Queenslanders would be to ensure that the issues around Commonwealth taxation arrangements in terms of capital gains tax are addressed. I fully support the idea of grandfathering negative-gearing arrangements which are overcooking the housing market, particularly in other states, and putting pressure on particularly first home buyers.

In addition to that, there is a direct correlation between incomes and the ability to save for a deposit and to afford to buy a house. Some of the measures that we are seeing from the Commonwealth currently are clearly designed to have the impact of reducing workers' wages. It is undeniable that hospitality workers have suffered two penalty rates cuts. They are about to suffer a third one if the Turnbull government is re-elected. It is those taxation principles, it is those impacts on household income, which are really at the heart of housing affordability for most Queenslanders.

Mr BERKMAN: Minister, will the Queensland Housing Strategy see the proportion of social housing decline over the next 10 years?

CHAIR: Member, I was going to allow the member for Burleigh to ask a question now. He has been champing at the bit.

Mr HART: I have a couple of questions to ask the DG, if I could. With reference to page 1 of the SDS, Director-General, did your department carry out a criminal history check on Jade Ingham to give to the minister and the cabinet?

CHAIR: Haven't you asked this before in relation to a fit and proper person—

Mr HART: No, I have not.

CHAIR: I think it is a bit repetitious.

Mr de BRENNI: I can answer it.

Mr HART: This is to the DG.

Mr de BRENNI: I can—

Mr HART: I am asking a question of the DG.

Ms Carroll: The department does not do the criminal history checks. I think the minister outlined the process earlier.

CHAIR: Yes, he did in great detail.

Ms Carroll: There is a process that is set out in the handbook and information goes up and criminal history checks are done on individuals.

Mr HART: Director-General, was there one done at all by anybody that you are aware of?

Ms Carroll: All the required checks were done.

Mr HART: With reference to page 5 of the SDS, there was a million dollars or slightly more spent on homelessness on the Gold Coast during the Commonwealth Games. Can you tell us how much of that million dollars was spent on administration and how much was spent on—

CHAIR: Is your question to the director-general?

Mr HART: To the director-general, yes.

Ms Carroll: I will see whether I can get the specifics. The process for the Commonwealth Games was that there was a very effective homelessness network on the Gold Coast and, effectively, an action plan was developed to ensure that homelessness was dealt with during the course of the Commonwealth Games. Part of that was providing funding to source additional temporary accommodation during the course of the Commonwealth Games. Different homelessness organisations were given that funding to enable them to source that particular accommodation. Some of the funding was used for that. I will need to check about the exact proportions of that funding.

Mr HART: If you could give us a breakdown, that would be great. I would like to table this photo. Minister, this is a photo that I will get you to have a look at. I seek leave to table the photo. Minister, given your responsibility for homelessness, did you or your office post this article on LinkedIn, complete with a picture of you posing as a homeless person?

Mr de BRENNI: I have not seen it.

CHAIR: We will have to distribute it to see whether leave is granted to have it tabled first. Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

Mr de BRENNI: I know this park bench quite well. This park bench is at the Powerhouse in Brisbane. The park bench was also where my wife and I had our wedding photographs taken several years ago. I and all of the other participants in the CEO Sleepout, which was held a couple of weeks ago, were asked by St Vincent de Paul, who coordinated the CEO Sleepout—in fact, we raised a record amount that night—to promote the CEO Sleepout so that we could pursue the goal throughout the course of that night to raise funds.

I want to thank the people who donated through my page—and that was promoted here—who donated \$7,856.38 to the cause of supporting homeless Queenslanders as a direct result of this activity. I would have to check, but I think the fundraising effort for the night exceeded a million dollars. A million dollars was fundraised for that night. I think there were about 300 of us. The member for Burleigh might want to describe it as 'posing as a homeless person'. What we were asked to do was put ourselves in the place of a homeless person and spend the night sleeping rough, as rough as it gets at the CEO Sleepout, to raise funds to support Queenslanders. It was also an opportunity that night, given that the dates happened to coincide, for me to announce the third round of Dignity First, a \$2.5 million fund to support innovation in supporting Queenslanders who are experiencing homelessness.

Mr HART: Minister, I fully support that particular project, but I would say to you that there does not appear to be any branding—

CHAIR: Do you have a question?

Mr HART: Yes.

CHAIR: Can we get to it, please?

Mr HART: I have only just started, Chair. There does not appear to be any branding on that particular post that it is the CEO Sleepout, and it was removed rather quickly from your LinkedIn page. Is this an attempt at poor shaming by you?

CHAIR: Really?

Mr HART: Yes, really.

Mr de BRENNI: I guess I will answer the question a few times. I do not think it has been removed from my LinkedIn page. If it has been it certainly was not done by me or my staff. The lanyard and ID card that was provided to participants of the CEO Sleepout are quite clearly visible in the photograph. If the member for Burleigh had bothered to show up to the event and contribute to it—

Mr HART: Really?

Mr de BRENNI: Yes, really.

Mr HART: Really?

CHAIR: Please allow the minister to answer—

Mr HART: So it is okay for him to attack me?

CHAIR: I think you have been given a fair bit of leeway, member for Burleigh, with some of the stunts you have pulled this afternoon.

Mr HART: This is outrageous.

CHAIR: I am going to allow the minister to answer the question and ask you to listen in silence. You asked the question. You are getting an answer.

Mr de BRENNI: I am advised that right now the article and the photograph remain on my LinkedIn page. Perhaps the member for Burleigh is confused or he is seeking to mislead the committee. I am unsure which—probably the first. This photograph, as I indicated, was taken along with all of the participants at the CEO Sleepout including people who have experienced homelessness themselves—one of whom was a fantastic guest speaker on the night who is now a resident in a social housing property called Common Ground. It was all done with an extreme level of compassion and goodwill. I invite the member for Burleigh to front up next year to the CEO Sleepout. You can pull up a piece of cardboard next to me and we can shiver the night away together and raise some funds. I welcome your participation.

CHAIR: We will now move to the member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: With reference to page 60 of the Capital Statement, it is noted that the target for construction of new homes across Queensland is dependent on the Commonwealth government continuing its responsibility to fund remote Indigenous housing. Will the minister advise the committee what plans are in place to support Queenslanders requiring safe, secure and sustainable housing now that it is clear that the Turnbull government will no longer provide ongoing funding for remote Indigenous housing?

Mr de BRENNI: I think, in part, my answer will help inform the member for Maiwar as well, who has a particular interest, I understand, in the amount of social housing that is being constructed in Queensland. We have invested \$1.8 billion in our Housing Strategy. That is about investing in housing but it is also about investing in jobs. The Housing Construction Jobs Program, which makes up a large component of the Housing Strategy is driving economic development in many regions across Queensland.

In particular, your question goes to the Commonwealth's decision to discontinue funding for remote Indigenous housing. The Commonwealth has played a key role right across Australia but particularly in Queensland for five decades. For half a century the Commonwealth has invested in closing the gap in Indigenous disadvantage in this state through the support of funding for housing. More recently, that has occurred through the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing. In 2017, the Commonwealth commissioned an independent report. The independent remote housing review found that the work of constructing homes in remote communities was not done and it needed to continue. It was quite clear. The national partnership agreement, which is the framework under which the Commonwealth has over the last 10 years met its commitments to closing the gap in remote communities, expired on 30 June 2018.

The 2018-19 Turnbull budget, the coalition budget, confirmed no further funding for remote housing. There were zero dollars committed in that budget for remote housing. We have committed \$1.6 billion in funding for housing in Queensland. The impact of this in remote Queensland will mean 850 jobs lost in remote Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. A thousand more who supply and support those projects will lose additional work. There were 52 apprentices in new construction in just six months from 1 July to 31 December 2017 who will find themselves not being able to complete their apprenticeships.

027 The Palaszczuk government, in cooperation with the Local Government Association of Queensland, Q Shelter and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander mayors, have consistently called on the Commonwealth to overturn its decision and recommit to ongoing Commonwealth investment, because we believe those Commonwealth communities should not be neglected. This Queensland budget allocates \$145.7 million over 2018-19, confirming Queensland's \$108 million per annum average over the next 10 years.

I have met with the Minister for Indigenous Affairs, Senator the Hon. Nigel Scullion, twice this year—once on 7 February and once on 26 June. I have written to him indicating that we need to pursue the construction of 1,100 new homes, maintain homes and include upgrades in places like Cherbourg, Yarrabah and Torres shire. All the Minister for Indigenous Affairs is interested in is making a severance payment to end that program and get beyond the next federal election unscathed. What it is going to mean, though, is that for us to be able to take action to secure the jobs of those 850 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders, those 52 apprentices, we will need to reprioritise construction of social housing that is happening in urban environments—in Burleigh, in Hervey Bay, in South Brisbane and in my neighbourhood of Logan—and reprioritise those funds into remote communities.

To draw into stark relief what that means in urban environments, let us take the electorate of Longman as an example. People are thinking about what is happening there tomorrow. We had planned in the next year to construct 46 new homes in Longman for people who are escaping domestic and family violence, people who are living in the parks and in shopping centre car parks in their cars, the elderly and the disabled. That reduces to six homes. That is 46 new homes in Longman down to six homes as a direct result of what Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull has decided to do about housing funding in Queensland. Not only that, that reduction in housing supply in Longman means rents go up across-the-board. It is a simple supply-and-demand equation. All renters in Longman will find pressure on their household budgets as rents start to rise, and I think they will be thinking about that when they show up to their local school to vote tomorrow.

We are going to see in those remote communities the return of things like rheumatic fever—diseases that we thought had been conquered here in this state. Those diseases will return to those Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities because of overcrowding. As a Labor government,

we will not turn our back on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities; we will continue to invest in those. We will deliver 97 new houses in remote communities by the end of the year. We will stretch our funding as necessary under the Housing Construction Jobs Program, but let me be clear: this will impact on every community right across this state, not just in remote Queensland but also on the Gold Coast, on the Sunshine Coast, here in Brisbane and in Ipswich, Cairns and Townsville. There will be fewer houses for Queenslanders because of the decision made by Prime Minister Turnbull to turn his back on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

Mrs MILLER: As the minister responsible for public works, can you tell us what programs are in place in your department in relation to preventing silicosis which is involved with the dry cutting of stone and man-made stone materials? I am asthmatic and I have also chaired the black lung committee. This is very close to my heart and the construction workers of Queensland.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you very much for the question. I am sure it is not lost on any members of the committee that the hearing tonight and the business of parliament is conducted in a building constructed of stone. Across the first term of the Palaszczuk government we witnessed the refitting of the sandstone here on this particular building. I want to acknowledge and congratulate the Building and Asset Services staff and the stonemasons who performed that intricate, difficult and quite beautiful work that they have delivered here. I want to acknowledge that on Monday under the recommenced Building and Asset Services Apprenticeship Program a new stonemasonry apprentice will commence work. This is fantastic news and it will carry on a proud tradition here in Queensland.

In terms of protection from those workplace illnesses, I can assure you that the Department of Housing and Public Works takes extremely seriously its obligations to ensure the health and safety of its workforce. We have been at the forefront of dealing with asbestos with the asbestos removal from schools program. Again, I want to acknowledge that the staff of Building and Asset Services have done a tremendous job in working through that significant program across all of our schools.

In respect of government contracts that are let in places where that work is not performed by Building and Asset Services, I can confirm that we have made it very clear in our tender documents and our contracts that we expect—we demand—the highest level of workplace health and safety systems to prevent all sorts of airborne diseases. With the learnings from recent inquiries into workplace dust and the illnesses that can lead to, I am sure all of the precautions that should be taken are being taken, but if we can do more we will. I will absolutely have a conversation with the director-general about whether there is any more we can do.

I too lost my grandfather to a dust borne disease, through mesothelioma. I understand the pain that victims of these preventable diseases—and that is the important point to make; they are preventable—go through. We will do everything we can to ensure that our staff, the people who contract to government and anybody who works in and around government buildings are protected. I mention the outcomes of the recent work around coal workers and pneumoconiosis. This is a serious condition, and I want to acknowledge and congratulate you for the leadership of your work on that inquiry in exposing the opportunity for reforms that can be made across workplaces anywhere that workers are exposed to dust.

Mrs MILLER: Minister, you may be aware of an organisation called RiseUp, which basically assists victims of domestic violence move into a new home. The homes are available for them but they furnish these homes. They have asked me to ask you a question. They have a need for an area where they can put the furniture that is donated to them. I am aware that there are parts of the Wolston Park complex near my electorate that have vacant buildings in there. Is there a possibility that they could use some of those vacant buildings at Wolston Park, which is now known as The Park mental health facility, to store the furniture that is donated to them?

Mr de BRENNI: I think practical steps that government can take to support organisations like that, no matter where they are across the state, should be taken so we can support their good work. I am not familiar enough with the state of those buildings in terms of their suitability for that. I have certainly seen them. What we should do is talk with the asset owner and assess if they can be used for that purpose. It seems like a very practical step that we can take to support organisations that are doing good work in Queensland. I am happy to engage with my ministerial colleagues who are working closely with organisations which are supporting women escaping domestic and family violence—Minister Farmer in particular, and others—to see if we can work something out. I would be very happy to do that.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you.

Mr MELLISH: Minister, page 6 of the Department of Housing and Public Works SDS details continued funding for the Dignity First Fund. Can you detail how the Dignity First Fund will support community driven innovation in the homelessness sector?

Mr de BRENNI: We established the Dignity First Fund back in 2016. This was about inviting innovative responses to assist Queenslanders experiencing homelessness to live with dignity and connect with the service system. It became apparent to me that, no matter how many homes are constructed, there will always be people who experience homelessness, be it for a short time or a longer time. We needed to ensure that not only did we take a bricks-and-mortar approach but we also supported people through that period and helped those Queenslanders get through those tough times to make it a little bit easier for them and also so they could go through it with a degree of dignity that all human beings deserve. It complements the work that is happening on increasing the social housing portfolio, it complements the funding that we expend on traditional homelessness services and it sits alongside existing strategies and programs that address homelessness.

We have talked about the number of homes that are being constructed—4,522 social housing dwellings, 786 commencements since June—but what we want to ensure is that if you are experiencing homelessness there is somebody there to support you through that with dignity. It is the third of the rounds of Dignity First, and it is a \$2½ million round. This third round closes on 17 August 2018. In the past, 50 projects have been funded and the innovations have been quite impressive. We have seen mobile coffee vans that work with young people who are homeless to learn skills so they can get a job and go on to be able to succeed in the private rental market. We have supported vehicles to rescue food and distribute nutritious meals to people who are experiencing homelessness. It has funded upgrades to service hubs in places like the community facilities in Centacare North Queensland out in Mount Isa. I have seen a kitchen facility in Logan as well.

One of the programs that I have found really impressive is the skills and driver training programs delivered by YellowBridge in Toowoomba. This is a facility that supports young girls who are escaping domestic violence. Some of them are teenagers who are living in completely unsuitable circumstances. YellowBridge provide a haven for them. It is transitional supported accommodation to young people experiencing homelessness. What they then do is provide those young people with the opportunity to get a driver's licence.

You can imagine in rural Queensland that if you do not have a driver's licence it is impossible to go to a job interview and then even if you do get the job it is impossible to get there. What people find is that they are then trapped in unsuitable accommodation, they are trapped in a cycle of violence or they are trapped in a cycle of dependence on things like social housing. What we saw there was the purchase and maintenance through Dignity First of a second-hand vehicle to assist young people complete their 100 hours of supervised driving and to cover their driver's licence fees, giving them independence to be able to get a job.

The community really got behind this initiative in Toowoomba. The local service station heard about what was going on when they came to fuel up there, so the service station owner chipped in free fuel. Just to round out that example of how great these innovations can be when you do things a little bit differently and you break away from the mould of just the bricks-and-mortar approach, I am advised that there are young women who moved into the property, went through the driver training, got their licence and now have a job at that same service station. They are completely independent and living on their own in the private rental market. They are the sorts of outcomes that we want to see from Dignity First as well. We are very pleased that we have been able to deliver on the Dignity First—two rounds that have been acquitted through Queensland so far and a third round that is soon to close. I am looking forward to announcing the successful recipients and seeing those innovations deliver for people experiencing homelessness.

028 CHAIR: I know we touched on this earlier, but I would like to hear a little bit more about the implementation of the government's security of payment reforms. This committee helped with that last time. I would like to see how we are going with it, thank you.

Mr de BRENNI: Before I answer that question, I wish to go back to the question the member for Bundamba asked about RiseUp. I want to let the member know that the previous round of Dignity First in 2017 provided funding for RiseUp for vehicles to collect and move donated items for women and families who have fled domestic and family violence. It is great to see that that project, funded under the 2017 round, has been so well supported in the community they now need some further space to store that stuff for when vulnerable women need it.

Mrs MILLER: All they need is a space because they cannot afford to pay warehouse fees, so it is really good. Members of my local community are very strongly involved in RiseUp. I would like to congratulate them, too.

Mr de BRENNI: As would I. I look forward to seeing what we can do, whether it is at The Park or somewhere else to make that—

Mrs MILLER:—and also on the Gold Coast if we could.

Mr de BRENNI: Chair, to answer your question—

CHAIR: Security of payments, yes.

Mr de BRENNI: As discussed earlier, the \$45 billion building and construction industry is a very important industry in Queensland. It is important to also ensure that it is a fair one where subcontractors are paid in full on time every time. The passage of the building industry fairness act in 2017, which is a significant reform designed to ensure confidence, will be implemented across the industry in tranches. It is important that we do it in tranches to make sure we get it right. We also committed to industry that the reform process would occur in a way that was manageable for the construction industry as they make significant changes to their operations. The first of the provisions commenced on 10 November 2017.

The QBCC will have a stronger role and there are stronger penalties for unlicensed building work with escalating penalties including one year imprisonment for third and subsequent offences for unlicensed building work. There are changes to combat the abhorrent practice of phoenixing including the definition of who is an influential person. Now the QBCC has a broader scope as to who they can rule out of the industry for the practices of phoenixing. There is a new penalty where a person who is a party to a building contract avoids complying with a contract clause and causes the other party to suffer a significant financial loss. These issues were well ventilated on talkback radio this week and I am pleased that these reforms are addressing those matters.

I mentioned earlier that in March 2018 the project bank accounts kicked off on government projects between \$1 million and \$10 million. The next tranche of reforms is planned to begin on 17 December 2018. These will replace the present Building and Construction Industry Payments Act and replace the Subcontractors' Charges Act. They will streamline the progress payment and adjudication processes. They will modernise and simplify the subcontractor charges provisions.

Currently, subcontractors have to mark their payment claim as being made under the act. Sometimes subbies may not want to make those claims in that way and mark that on there because they do not want to jeopardise working relationships. Soon those subcontractors will no longer be required to do that. Payers the next layer up the contracting chain will need to issue either a payment schedule setting out the amount to be paid or pay in full by the due date, and there will be a penalty for failing to do that. That is the first time in Queensland's history that we have had this regime in place.

We have seen the devastating consequences for subcontractors when contractors up the chain from them hold out. It has led to business collapses; it has led to devastating circumstances in family businesses. I am looking forward to seeing much less of that as we rub out dodgy practices. Of course, the Building Industry Fairness Reforms and Implementation Evaluation Panel, which has been established with government and the building industry to assess the implementation of the legislation, is already underway.

Mr HART: You can thank the LNP for that one.

CHAIR: Can you please cease interjecting? Minister, continue.

Mr de BRENNI: I appointed four eminent professionals to the panel. I want to thank Ms Bronwyn Weir, who is the chair, Ms Jennifer Robertson, Mr Troy Lewis and Ms Fiona Aitchison Reid. The panel has already started work on setting their evaluation plan, their work program and their stakeholder engagement plan. The chair, Ms Bronwyn Weir, also briefed my ministerial construction council recently. I am very much looking forward to working with the panel and receiving their recommendations as we go along and we improve and tweak the program of building industry fairness reforms to ensure they are delivering on our objectives.

The real drive behind this is that we know from the analysis that was done that if we are able to deliver on the objectives of these reforms Queensland businesses in the construction industry will be more confident, they will employ more Queenslanders and there will be fewer disruptions and disputes. That is good for everybody, whether you are a licensee yourself or you are someone who is seeking to own a building or have one constructed for you.

CHAIR: We will now go to the member for Burleigh, who has been interjecting. He gets a question now.

Mr HART: Thank you. At last!

CHAIR: There is a large crossbench who have to ask questions, too. If you just ask your question instead of whingeing, you might get some more.

Mr HART: Let's get on with it then. I refer the DG to SDS page 14. I understand that the Queensland State Archivist is the formal data custodian of Minister Bailey's emails. Is there any reason these emails cannot be released?

CHAIR: I thought we established last year that the State Archivist is not able to be questioned. Minister, did you wish to—

Mr HART: I am questioning the DG.

Ms Carroll: The State Archivist has roles and responsibilities under the state archives act, and that is about the disposal of public records.

Mr HART: Can those emails be released? Is there any reason they cannot be?

Ms Carroll: The emails are not a matter for the State Archivist. The State Archivist's role is administration of the act.

Mr HART: Minister, we are running out of time, so a short answer would be great. You have already talked about the Queensland procurement strategy quite a lot. With regard to the enhancements, can you tell me if the best practice industrial relations section of your enhancements means—can you rule out that companies will have to have industrial enterprise bargaining agreements in place because of this?

Mr de BRENNI: How companies that tender for Queensland government work manage their industrial affairs is entirely a matter for them. What we have made clear is that we expect that companies deliver quality jobs for Queenslanders, so they are safe jobs, they are decent and secure jobs. We have made a decision that we will preference companies that are able to best demonstrate that they have high-quality, safe and local jobs, and I think that is exactly what taxpayers expect of us. There is no obligation or requirement on anyone to have any particular type of industrial relations arrangements in place.

Mr HART: They will still get government jobs even if they do not have an EB?

Mr de BRENNI: It is a matter for them. I cannot compel anybody to do anything.

Mr HART: Minister, I want to table a letter that has been received by a number of plumbers who have lost their licences. The letter is pretty explanatory. Can I—

CHAIR: You need to seek leave to table that, so if you will just pass out a copy.

Mr HART: They were going to be the next words out of my mouth. I seek leave to table this document.

CHAIR: I am reading your mind. We have been together too long.

Mr HART: Minister, briefly, it appears as though the previous government made changes such that occupational licences did not have to be renewed anymore because if you had a contractor's licence you did not have to have an occupational licence. However, the act was never changed. This happened late in the term of the previous government. Your government did not change the act. The QBCC has now worked out that this is an issue. A lot of plumbers have lost their licence and there is a \$350 new application fee. My question to you is: will you waive that fee and the process for these plumbers so they can get their licence back?

CHAIR: Have you got a copy there, Minister?

Mr de BRENNI: Chair, I am just trying to make sense of this email because the dates are not on it. It is hard to verify what it is or who it is from.

Mr HART: Can I just clarify for the minister? I have redacted those, but I have the original here, which I am quite happy to share with the committee. I just did not want to make it public.

CHAIR: I am just asking if we are allowed to have personal details or not. I will seek leave to have this document tabled, anyway. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. We will work with what we have and the minister can answer with what you have there.

Mr de BRENNI: I am very familiar with this issue. I think the member for Burleigh was at the plumbing industry awards dinner on Friday night where I made reference to this issue. I am aware that the former LNP minister for public works, the member for Everton, on three occasions informed the industry, including through correspondence from the QBCC and I think parliamentary statements as well—I would have to check on that—that he had committed to making a range of amendments to the occupational and contractor licence classes for plumbers. I think 17 October 2014 was one of the last dates on which he wrote to occupational plumbers and drainers telling them that they only have to hold one licence. I am advised that the then minister failed to make the necessary legislative amendments.

Mr HART: It was very late in the term of government.

Mr de BRENNI: He failed to make them for the entirety of the term of government and had made statements to the industry on repeated occasions and also referred to matters before the House back in that government's administration—

Mr HART: Let's fix it.

CHAIR: Member, you are not here to debate. You asked a question. You are getting an answer.

Mr de BRENNI: If you want to open up the issue, I am very happy to talk to it, member for Burleigh. A number of times—and it was not what I would describe at the start as late in the term—the member for Everton referred to matters before the House indicating that it would address those matters. Whether that was designed to mislead plumbers or it was a matter of incompetence of the former minister, that change did not occur.

Mr HART: Or since.

CHAIR: Member, stop interjecting.

Mr de BRENNI: If I can answer the question—

CHAIR: The minister is answering the question. If you keep interjecting—remember you are here with the leave of the committee. Just wait for the answer.

Mr de BRENNI: What I have not done, which former minister Mander did, is go out and tell the industry, 'It's all been taken care of,' and, 'I have a bill before parliament,' which was clearly misleading the industry. That meant that plumbers rightfully thought—you get statements in parliament, you get letters from the minister and then letters from the commission saying you do not have to have an occupational license. It is unsurprising then that 5,300 individual licensed plumbing and drainage contractors were left vulnerable without the appropriate licensing.

029 What I have committed to is identifying an approach to the future of licensing in consultation with the Service Trades Council and all of the other areas of licensed trades and contractors. We have to remember that plumbers are not the only individuals that hold both an occupational and a contractor licence. In the interests of fairness, one ought to think that if you are going to do it for plumbers you do it for everybody. At the same time, one needs to take into account the financial sustainability of the QBCC. Let us remember that the way the QBCC was established and structured was that it was effectively, and remains effectively, funded through two income streams—one is the Home Warranty Scheme and the other is licence fees. When you make sweeping promises that you cannot keep to industry, it is very dangerous territory that I will not walk on. What I will do is work in cooperation with the industry and address it in a methodical way. I have put in writing my commitment to do that. I think the plumbing industry is well aware of that. I am confident that I have the confidence of those individuals who are affected and I can assure you that steps are being taken to do this job and do it properly, unlike the misleading efforts of the former minister in 2014.

Mr HART: Thank you, Minister. Can I seek leave to table this document that I have passed over?

CHAIR: We will circulate it and then seek leave to table it.

Mr HART: Just for the committee's information, this is from the Plumbers Union website today. Minister—

CHAIR: It does not seem to have any labelling on it.

Mr HART: That information on contractors' licences is still there today on their website. If you look at the last page it still says that you do not need an occupational licence. Minister, you have now been in government for over three years. Why have you not fixed this before?

CHAIR: Minister, do you have a copy of this?

Mr de BRENNI: I do not know what it is.

CHAIR: He assures us that it is from the Plumbers Union website. I cannot see anything that says that it is from there, but I guess we have to take you—

Mr HART: Take my word for it.

CHAIR: We will seek leave to have it tabled, assuming it is from the Plumbers Union website. Leave is granted.

Mr de BRENNI: I cannot speak for the practices of organisations external to government in updating their websites, but what I can say is that we worked closely with the Queensland Building and Construction Commission to ensure that those individuals that were put in an invidious position by former minister Mander—

Mr HART: Three years, Minister—three years.

Mr de BRENNI: You said it was late in the term. On 22 May 2014 the then minister for housing and public works, the honourable Tim Mander, said that you will need to hold and pay for one licence only—that is, 22 May 2014. If he was genuinely going to make this change, there was more than ample time for the then minister to do it. What ended up happening was that plumbers discovered that they were in breach of the act by not holding the requisite licence because they had been misled by the LNP and that put into question—

Mr HART: You have not fixed it.

CHAIR: Can you please stop your interjections, member. I do not know how many times you have done it, but you will get warned if you continue. Minister.

Mr de BRENNI:—the validity of plumbing work right across many local government areas. What I have done is ensure that the Queensland Building and Construction Commission resolves those things. Member for Burleigh, you do not get to just make a decision that you do not want the acts of this parliament to not apply to people in any industry. Quite frankly, it did and we have made sure that those plumbers who were affected have not been fined. We have made sure that we have not had a situation where their work has had to be ripped up and started again.

I have made it very clear to the plumbing industry that we will address this issue and we will address it in an appropriate time and in a way that is fair to the other occupational trades and contractors, in a way that ensures the financial sustainability of the commission and in a way that does not leave any licensee in a position where they may be found to not have the appropriate licence.

CHAIR: Thank you. Member, do you have another question?

Mr HART: Yes. Minister, I could actually tell you a whole lot of legislation your government has made announcements about and not followed through with yet. My next question relates to the SDS at page 4 with regard to department overview services that support government agencies and the government's ICT Dashboard. I note the Auditor-General's report tabled yesterday, *Monitoring and managing ICT projects*, but the department is still experiencing difficulty in reporting and updating their ICT projects. In fact, the specific concerns that were raised are that 32 of about \$161 million worth of projects have a lack of explanatory notes and 18 per cent have been in the delivery phase for over three years. Minister, given these shortcomings identified in the Auditor-General's report, can you outline what actions you are taking to fix this?

Mr de BRENNI: I thank the member for Burleigh for the question. Committee members would be aware that the ICT Dashboard that I became responsible for under the machinery-of-government changes following the November 2017 election was designed by the Newman government in response to some significant ICT failures. You would be aware that the responsibility that I have is to administer the ICT Dashboard and you would also be aware that it is the responsibility of agencies that are investing in ICT projects to provide the requisite information.

We in the Department of Housing and Public Works maintain the dashboard. I have read the Queensland Audit Office's report into the dashboard. There are six recommendations that I think we will work hard to implement and that we will likely accept. There is a seventh recommendation around automated controls to validate when data is entered and I think agreement in principle is the position that we will move forward on with that one. I think the member for Burleigh and everyone else on the committee knows full well that it is the responsibility of individual departments to be responsible for their own data and providing their own information to the ICT Dashboard. My job is to ensure that the dashboard is operational.

CHAIR: Member, do you have another question?

Mr HART: Yes, I have a question to the DG. Director-General, could you provide to the committee the government's cybersecurity policy and can you tell us how well prepared the state departments are to deal with the inevitable cybersecurity attacks, data breaches and things like that?

Ms Carroll: I thank the member for the question. The department does a lot of work within our own area in terms of cybersecurity and also works with the departments right across government around cybersecurity. The number of attacks—denial-of-service attacks and things like that—on the Queensland government system and the way that they have been handled through the cybersecurity unit has been very successful over the years. The government has certainly funded additional initiatives around cybersecurity and, as I am sure you are aware, because of the nature of cyber attacks and all of those sorts of things, it is something that is updated all of the time.

I can give you a few of the statistics. We have staff within the cybersecurity unit. They work for both the QGCIO, the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer, and within CITEC itself. Both the minister and I have visited the operations centre and seen the load that is put right across the system and how successful the work of that unit has been. There have been 24 high and medium attacks that have happened that have been dealt with. The cybersecurity operations centre blocks an average of 5,500 malicious domain name system requests per minute out of an average of 100,000 denial-of-service requests scanned per minute. That is the kind of huge volume that the department is dealing with.

Mr HART: Sorry. I might have missed it, but did you say that you could provide the policy to the committee?

Ms Carroll: I can certainly have a look at giving you that. It is on the website of the QGCIO.

Mr HART: I ask for the QBCC commissioner to come back to the table again.

CHAIR: I just remind you, member, to make your next questions brief in the interests of fairness. Government members would like to ask some more questions.

Mr HART: Commissioner, I will be gentle this time. Can you tell us what qualifications your staff who are doing minimum financial requirements have with regard to accounting?

Mr Bassett: I thank the member for the question. As the minister said before with respect to a response to a question on notice, we have a forensic accountant. Actually, I withdraw that. We have a vacant forensic accountant spot at the moment. We did establish a forensic accounting person. They had to leave as a result of family matters only a short time ago. In respect of that specific person and his position description, I can confirm that they are required to either be a member of Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand or be a certified practising accountant. Other staff in the team that deal with minimum financial requirements matters are experienced in respect of financial analysis. They have a significant understanding of the minimum financial requirements policy and licensing requirements as required under the QBCC Act.

Mr HART: Minister, you said before that the new financial requirements would be tabled on 1 January, I think, under a regulation. That is the target.

Mr de BRENNI: Yes.

Mr HART: That is well outside the sitting period of parliament, I would think, given that we finish in November or December and we probably will not sit again until February or March, so there will be no inspection of that regulation by the parliament. Do you think you could table the regulation before the parliament rises so that we can have a look at it, because it is a pretty important thing?

Mr de BRENNI: I can assure the members of the committee that the industry will have an opportunity to be fully across the matter. I made it very clear at the last meeting of the Ministerial Construction Council that we would circulate within a few days following that a discussion paper. I am advised that it has already gone to the Ministerial Construction Council for comment. I think I wrote to your office, member for Burleigh, indicating that I am happy to provide a briefing in relation to that. The consultation will be very thorough and the regulation will be operational—it is my intent—from 1 January, but the regulation will be made in advance of that.

Mr HART: Yes, so that is the third tranche of the changes. The second one you are aiming for 17 December. Is there a particular reason for 17 December?

030

Mr de BRENNI: Yes, it is a reasonable question, Chair. 17 December is widely regarded in the industry as the first day after the construction industry closes down for the year, so the construction industry is likely to close down on the last Friday of the school term. Whilst there will be many projects that will be winding up through that time, 17 December has been chosen as an appropriate time, given

that much of the industry will not return to full operation until after Australia Day. It is not the rule, but it is the norm, as I am sure committee members are aware. It gives an opportunity for the industry to start preparing in advance of 17 December. When they return in late January, early February, they should not have the volume of payment claims that they would ordinarily have at the conclusion of a normal month, at the conclusion of January. In fact, they might get to the end of January and have only a handful.

We regarded that and it was confirmed through consultation with the Ministerial Construction Council members that that was an appropriate day to commence—17 December. Without that context, it sounds like a strange day on which to commence a provision, but there are sound reasons for it.

Mr HART: Just back to remote housing—

CHAIR: Member, this will be your last question.

Mr HART: Yes. Is it not true that you are still negotiating with the federal government around the partnership agreement and that the argument rests with how many houses will be built, the time frame in which they will be built and the quantum of money that the Queensland government will contribute?

Mr de BRENNI: No, the negotiation, if you want to call it that, is not a true reflection of the status of the Commonwealth's position. The Turnbull budget has no money allocated. The budget papers show that there is no money allocated for remote Indigenous housing. The minister has put to the Queensland government that they will make a severance payment to walk away from funding the work that has been happening for half a century to close the gap in remote communities. They are saying that they will make that severance payment on the basis that the Queensland government increases its commitment from the funding that has been committed—I think I mentioned it before—of \$145 million this year—by another \$100 million.

Our budget was handed down by the Treasurer before that position was put. The Minister for Indigenous Affairs knows that the Queensland government has made a commitment of \$147 million, or an average of \$108 million per annum, over the next 10 years. He knows full well—and I have met with Minister Scullion and we have had this conversation—what the Queensland contribution can be. This attempt to orchestrate some semblance of a negotiation is merely a tactic for the Turnbull government to say to Queenslanders, 'Look the other way while we walk away from supporting half a century of closing the gap efforts.'

Certainly, if Minister Scullion and the Prime Minister can be convinced to make a contribution to add to our \$147 million, we will welcome that. It will go directly towards the construction of houses and supporting those new jobs but, at the moment, it has been made clear that Minister Scullion's and Prime Minister Turnbull's terms are to walk away and/or to force a position that cannot be delivered and they know that.

I find it quite distressing that the Commonwealth has made this decision. I spoke before about the impact that it is going to have on 40 families in Longman. That is 40 families who will be homeless as a direct result of that—

Mr HART: That is not—

Mr de BRENNI: On the north side of Brisbane. That will happen in Cairns, it will happen on the Gold Coast, it will happen in Townsville. That is the result of the Prime Minister's decision.

Mr MELLISH: Can the minister advise the committee how the Palaszczuk government's new nonconforming building product laws are ensuring that our built environment is safe for all Queenslanders?

Mr de BRENNI: I thank the member for Aspley. Before I answer that question, if it is okay with the chair, I made an error in answer to a question asked by member for Traeger before. I apologise. I said that the first contract awarded for project bank accounts was the Richmond fire and rescue station. It was the Palm Island project and the Richmond fire and rescue station came hot on its heels as the second one. I apologise to the committee for that error. Thank you, member for Traeger. I appreciate it.

I want to address the question from the member for Aspley about nonconforming building products. We taking very seriously our commitment to ensuring the safety of Queensland's built environment. Queensland's nonconforming building product laws are not just nation leading; they are world leading. They were introduced on 1 November 2017 and for the first time place obligations right up and down the building products supply chain, specifically for designers, manufacturers, importers, suppliers and installers. They are designed so that they are delivering products that are safe, fit for

purpose and, importantly, do not claim to be something they are not. They also strengthen the commission's compliance and enforcement powers. The commission now has some very effective, very modern compliance tools, such as enforceable undertakings, to deal with what is a very contemporary issue.

The most visible, the most public issue, has been around the issue of combustible cladding. We have broadened the powers of entry into buildings for the Queensland Building and Construction Commission. Peculiarly, it was unable to enter a completed building to inspect the building. We have now given them the power to enter finished buildings. They can pursue the removal and rectification of nonconforming building products that are causing a risk to the health and safety of Queensland. Previously, they were constrained to only active construction sites.

They are important powers, because often the issue of nonconforming building products, as we have seen with combustible cladding, does not become apparent to the building owner or the public until after the building is constructed. Since those laws were in place in November to the end of the financial year, the commission has received 165 complaints or inquiries in relation to nonconforming building products. Thirty-eight of those are under investigation. Seventy-three complaints were finalised during the period and 54 were referred for further investigation, including with other government authorities.

On 9 May 2018, the committee would be familiar with the exercising of new powers under section 74AW of the QBCC Act where I ordered Clark Rubber to recall their portable pool fence starter kit. This issue was brought to the attention of the QBCC by a consumer, who saw a young child reach inside and open this pool gate, obviously putting kids at risk of drowning. Clearly, the system failed the pool safety standard, which is administered by the QBCC.

I am pleased to say that Clark Rubber fully cooperated with the ministerial recall. They agreed to voluntarily recall their product in all the other states as well. The standard that was set for protecting the safety of young people around pools in Queensland was voluntarily adopted by the company in all of those other jurisdictions as well, demonstrating that the work of the commission in so many spheres is nation leading.

That is an important demonstration of the legal and operational capacity that the QBCC is developing, including reaching beyond state borders. I am very pleased with the work that the QBCC has been able to do. I look forward to continuing to ensure that Queensland's built environment is safe and secure for all Queenslanders.

CHAIR: Thanks, Minister. The member for Bundamba has a question and, if we then have time, the member for Traeger has a question. We will see how we go.

Mrs MILLER: This question is probably more directed to the director-general. Following the impending appointment, hopefully, after next month of an administrator to Ipswich City Council, can your department begin discussions to build a pool and recreational complex at Redbank Plains? The people of Redbank Plains tell me that they can fund this new pool out of the savings of the salaries of the mayor, the councillors and their staff—all up about 36 people—the leases and expenses of their electorate offices, the cars, fuel cards and savings on travel.

Mr de BRENNI: Member for Bundamba, do you mind if I respond to the question?

Mrs MILLER: Yes, that is all right.

Mr de BRENNI: Members may be aware that within the Department of Housing and Public Works we have a commercialised business unit called Building and Asset Services. If there is an entity that has funds at its disposal and would like to contract to Building and Assets Services to do that work, we would be happy to tender for that project.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIR: Member for Traeger, your quick question.

Mr KATTER: I refer to page 12 of the SDS. I acknowledge the good intent of the government's Young Athletes Travel Subsidy. However, given that the return flight from Mount Isa to Brisbane is often up to \$2,000, what will the government do to ensure that talented athletes in remote areas are still adequately supported?

Mr de BRENNI: That is an excellent question, member for Traeger. The Young Athletes Travel Subsidy is something that I think is raised with probably all members of the House on a regular basis. It is designed to provide a subsidy for athletes competing at a high level on behalf of their district for state or national titles to enable them to pay for some of their travel costs. We know that quite often

those travel costs far exceed the subsidy. I think the other difficulty that particularly parents face is that it is paid upon the provision of a receipt for the travel. Quite often, many families do not have access to credit, yet they have a number of young sports stars in their home whom they would like to support to be able to compete at those levels. We want to make sure that as many of those kids can.

I think the Young Athletes Travel Subsidy can be improved to help eliminate that level of inequality of access to sport that is made more acute by the fact of where people might live, how remote they are and their incomes. I want to encourage the member for Traeger and his constituents to actively engage with the sport and active recreation strategy development process. If we can improve the Young Athletes Travel Subsidy through a discussion with the community, I would very much like to do that.

I am advised that there will be some consultation sessions held by the department in Traeger, in particular in Mount Isa. I know that I am going to Longreach very soon. I expect to hear from the people of Longreach who are in a very similar set of circumstances. I will certainly be happy to receive advocacy directly from you, member for Traeger, or any other members of parliament.

Mr KATTER: Thank you.

CHAIR: Thank you, Minister. There were two questions that were taken on notice that you may have answers for. I believe one was to the director-general and it was in relation to the homeless on the Gold Coast during the Commonwealth Games and an administration cost.

Mr de BRENNI: Yes, the director-general can respond to that question in some detail.

Ms Carroll: Thank you. Of the \$1.1 million, \$512,047 was provided directly for service delivery. The remaining funds were for things like employee expenses, other supplies and services. We provided four front-line staff and a project manager for that particular project.

CHAIR: Thank you. The other one was the recovery by the QBCC on the home warranty scheme from directors of companies.

Mr de BRENNI: I can respond to that, chair. I can inform the committee that the rate of compliance with directions to rectify increased to 42 per cent in the last year. The amount of claims recovered in 2017-18 from persons through whose fault the claim arose was \$10,360,512.02 excluding legal costs recovered.

CHAIR: Okay. The member for Bundamba was getting a report and I remember the member for Hervey Bay was quite concerned that the committee would get that report. The member for Bundamba will share that with the committee. We will clarify that.

Mrs MILLER: Yes, I undertake to do so.

CHAIR: Thank you. The time allocated for the consideration of the estimates of expenditure for the portfolio areas of Housing and Public Works, Digital Technology and Sport has expired. I thank the minister for answering those questions on notice. There are no further questions on notice. Thank you, Minister, and departmental officers for your attendance. Minister, if there is anyone you wish to thank, you can take a moment to do so now.

Mr de BRENNI: I would like to thank the chair and the members of the committee. I want to thank the visitors to the committee and the parliamentary staff for being here late on a Friday night. I hope you have all enjoyed the week. I want to thank the director-general and her team, the CEOs who are here with us today and my staff as well. To those people who the Department of Housing and Public Works is there to serve, I want to wish them all well, particularly those people who are experiencing homelessness in Queensland tonight. I hope they find services that are able to support them. To the subbies and tradies who are showing up to work and the builders who are showing up to work tomorrow morning doing a bit of extra work, I hope they get home from work safe. To everybody who is playing sport tonight and over the weekend, all the best. For those people who are doing a stack of work behind here keeping us all connected, particularly in the world of digital technology, I want to acknowledge them and thank them for making sure that all of the technology that we have around us delivers what it does. Thank you very much for the opportunity to submit to the questions of the committee.

CHAIR: Thank you, Minister. I would also like to thank the members of the committee and visiting members who attended the hearing throughout the whole day. I also thank Hansard, the secretariat and everyone else who assisted here today. I declare the hearing closed.

The committee adjourned at 6.31 pm.